

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o LXXIV. JANUARY 1894.

ART. I.—NATURAL THEOLOGY AND
EVOLUTION.

BISHOP BARRY'S 'BAMPTON LECTURES.'

Some Lights of Science on the Faith. By ALFRED BARRY,
D.D., D.C.L., Canon of Windsor, late Primate of Australia.
(London, 1892.)

BISHOP BARRY'S Bampton Lectures form a welcome contribution to the apologetic side of theology. They are the work of an older theologian who has passed through, not unobservantly, the various movements and contests of the last half-century, and who thus brings to the consideration of present problems a large experience gained in the past. The calm and measured judgments which the Bishop passes may well arrest the attention of younger men. Experience may well be set over against impetuosity and confidence; for it is, in truth, a potent factor in these matters. New theories, often of a revolutionary character, come into vogue, and younger men get attracted by them. They embrace them, and believe in them with all their hearts, and look forward to the time when they must universally prevail. Older men, who have come through a similar experience themselves, or have witnessed it in others, know better. They know by experience that such theories, however plausible, are founded on a partial and one-sided view of things. They have seen in their own case this one-sidedness corrected, and their favourite dogmas much modified, if not altogether destroyed. The truth is that in the intellectual and spiritual worlds thoroughgoing revolutions have no place. Revolutionary movements are with the progress of time dissipated and lost: they pass away like a

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. LXXIV.

S

ripple on the surface of a far broader and deeper movement. All that they accomplish is that details elicited by them, which have a solid and permanent character, are absorbed in and enrich the onward movement of things.

Before proceeding to remark on certain points raised by the Bishop, we will give some account of his Lectures. Their real, though not their explicit, aim is towards the rehabilitation of natural theology viewed as a theological discipline. The Lectures, in truth, form one of many indications that the tide is turning in this direction. The form under which the Bishop has shaped his Lectures is quaint but not ineffective. It is derived from his leading text, 'The Law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ that we might be justified by faith,' and the scope of the work is to show that, just as the Law of Sinai, which St. Paul contemplated, when properly understood, had this effect, so the same thing is also true of the reign of Law in nature which is preached to us by science. The first Lecture is orientative. It emphasizes the fact that laws of nature are not ultimate, that they cannot stand alone, but are necessarily dependent on something else; that, in fact, just as the Law of Sinai proceeded from and was dependent upon God, and was an expression of His Righteousness, so the laws that rule in nature must be understood as proceeding from the Creator and as being an expression of His Will and Purpose. The laws of nature thus point upwards to God, and are a schoolmaster to lead our reason up to God. It is true that in the present day this is not always admitted; it is true that there is a section of opinion which looks upon Law as ultimate and absolute, as that beyond which we cannot go. Such a view we have in Agnosticism. Like the Jew, the Agnostic emphatically rests in the Law, and denies to human reason its grandest and ultimate step. But this mode of viewing the matter the Bishop regards as really retrograde, and he quotes St. Paul in support of his contention. It is a view also which is out of harmony with the real tendency of science. Everything in science seems to point upwards and to justify the step by which human reason rises to God. Science in manifold ways bears witness to a unity in the ultimate Source of all being. It thus creates an expectancy which can only be satisfied by Theism.

Having thus vindicated the function of Law as leading to Christ, the remainder of the first Lecture is devoted to a statement of the various ways in which the function is performed. It acts in three ways: first, by way of confirming the faith; secondly, by way of elucidation of the faith; and, thirdly, by

way of correction and criticism of the faith. The treatment of these three heads gives the subject of the different Lectures, a certain number of Lectures being devoted to each head. Under the first head the confirmatory two subjects emerge, the principle of heredity and the principle of evolution, to which two Lectures, the second and the third, are respectively devoted. In treating of the principle of heredity in the second Lecture, the author shows how it confirms in a remarkable manner the great theological principle of mediation. For the principle of heredity manifests the solidarity of mankind, and emphasizes inheritance from forefathers. It thus illustrates and confirms the mediatorial office assigned by theology to Christ, and shows how He can be viewed as the Second Adam, the representative and redeemer of humanity. Analogically, also, it illustrates the doctrine of Original Sin viewed as a transmission, as also the sacramental inheritance of the new nature of the Second Adam. In addition to this the same principle brushes away many difficulties connected with individualism as opposed to solidarity which perplexed the Church in times of old, and enables us to assign to each of these its proper place. In the third Lecture the doctrine of evolution is taken up, as 'illustrating the progress in all creation to a higher perfection'; and it is shown how the doctrine of the Incarnation dovetails into this progress. The Incarnation is a grand step in advance within the sphere of humanity, just as there have been similar steps in the previous history of things. It is the planting of a germ of new life in the human sphere—a germ which is destined to perfect itself under the providence and grace of God till the end of this dispensation.

The second head under which the author classes the function of Law as leading to Christ is that of elucidation, and here he finds a subject for two more Lectures, the fourth and the fifth. The fourth Lecture has for its title 'Christ and all Creation,' and its purport is to bring out the infinite enlargement of our scientific conception of the universe as one great whole, in which the earth with all its inhabitants is but a speck. This yields an elucidation of Christian doctrine of a character little dreamt of in days of old. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians define the Dominion of Christ as extending not only over the Church, not only over humanity at large, but over all created being gathered up in Himself; and the Church in days of old formed a grand idea of the Dominion of Christ. But it is now shown by the advance of science how inadequate that idea was as compared with the reality. By

the advance of science our idea of the grandeur of Christ's Dominion is now enlarged past all expression. The fifth Lecture, 'Christ and Human Society,' has reference to the light thrown by the progress of social science on the relation of Christ to human society. The effect of this is to clear up the relation between individual freedom and common life. The movement of the sixteenth century brought out the great principle of individualism in religion. It put the individual face to face with God in Christ ; it taught the individual man to isolate himself as it were from all the world, and to seek from God alone in Christ pardon and grace. The principle is true so far, but if it stands alone it is found to be insufficient. With the progress of social science light has been thrown on the correlative principle of the unity of all humanity in Christ. This principle expresses itself, first, in the Catholic Church spread throughout the world, and, secondly, in the various bonds of natural society, into which Christ has poured a new life.

Next we come to the Critical function of Law. The subject divides itself into two parts which form the subject of the two subsequent Lectures. We have, first, 'Criticism and the Supernatural,' which is dealt with in the sixth Lecture, and, secondly, 'Criticism and Holy Scripture,' which is treated in the seventh. The former Lecture is an exceedingly good one, and it brings out very fully and clearly both the natural and the supernatural aspect of Christianity. The account of the successive phases of the controversy as to miracles is very clear, and the author shows how the endurance of this critical test has cleared up our notions in regard to the supernatural without diminishing the fulness of our belief. The criticism to which Holy Scripture has been subjected, which is considered in the seventh Lecture, has not, at least as yet, led to results equally satisfactory. Possibly this is owing to its being yet in its infancy. At any rate, its present aspect is more that of antagonism to Divine Revelation, and, as the author remarks, in certain hands it really merits the epithet 'destructive.' Nevertheless it has to be faced quietly and resolutely ; and it must itself be subjected to a searching criticism from the other side. Many of the positions now assumed in the advanced criticism of Holy Scripture it will be impossible finally to hold ; and the whole character of the controversy is likely to be changed by the bringing forward, on the side of the defence, of fresh aspects of the question now lying in the background. The position the author takes up is one of hopefulness, and he appeals in support of it to past

experience. 'The experience,' he says, 'of the last half-century may, I must think, read to us here lessons of encouragement. I have myself seen methods of such criticism come and go, sometimes destroying each other. I have seen results of criticism, once accepted as final and imperishable, now rejected on all hands, and doctrines of revelation, once scouted as unphilosophical and impossible, now allowed to be accordant with the truest and deepest philosophy.' We agree with the Bishop in believing that a similar fate will befall much that is now advanced with the utmost confidence in regard to the Old Testament.

The last Lecture has for its title 'Truth in Revelation'; and it is devoted to the consideration of the question: Is the Bible true? The author distinguishes with great clearness the different departments in which we are to seek this truth. First, the historic element: Is the Bible true in respect to its history? Secondly, the prophetic element: Is there in the Bible moral truth, first in the enunciation of the Law, and secondly in prophecy as a preparation for Christ? Thirdly, the Psalmic element: Is there in the Psalms the utterance of subjective moral truth as also a right conception of God and man? Lastly, the theologic revelation: Does the Bible give a true revelation of the nature of God Himself? In dealing with this last division of Bible truth, the author first alludes to lower revelations of God in nature and in human history; and then he remarks that a true revelation of God must not only confirm and illustrate these two, but must transcend both. After this there follows a fine passage descriptive of the Bible Revelation of God, which we give as an illustration of the author's style:—

'It is precisely this which the Scriptural Revelation of God claims to do. The idea of God grows, widens, deepens through the whole; and we note that at each point it is at once personal in relation, yet universal in itself. The Creator of all the world is yet close, in tender care and love, to the man made in His image. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is in covenant with His chosen servants, while yet He is always known as "the God Almighty," "the Judge" and Ruler "of the whole earth." The Jehovah of that Mosaic Revelation which is wrought out by the whole order of the Prophets is the God and King of the chosen nation of Israel, close to their action and their thought at every point, and dwelling between the Cherubims, in the tabernacle or temple which is His chosen seat of revelation to them; yet the very meaning of the name proclaims Him as the One Eternal Self-existent Being, fountain of all created life, the One ultimate object of all created reverence and love. The final revelation, in the word of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, is of the supreme

mystery of the Triune Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, stamped in Baptism on the very forefront of Christianity ; yet of the fulness of that Godhead, as dwelling bodily in the true Son of Man, whom we know, as it were face to face, and through Him dwelling in measure in the very heart of the simplest humanity' (p. 317).

The author concludes this chapter and the series of his Lectures by recapitulating and pointing out the cumulative effect of this threefold witness of science to Christ.

We are generally in accord and always in sympathy with the author, and hence any remarks we may have to make on points raised will be not so much by way of criticism as by way of further elucidation. The first point we wish to take up is the interpretation which the Bishop gives to the 'reign of Law' in nature. In view of the Lectures this is probably the most important point of all, for if the Bishop's interpretation is not admitted the main argument of the Lectures is to that extent nullified. As we have already indicated, the Bishop regards the reign of Law in nature as the expression of the will and purpose of the Creator ; but it will be best to give the view he takes in his own words. He says :—

'For science claims it as its function and its glory, to enforce and continually to advance, both in clearness and in scope, the recognition of the "reign of Law." I press advisedly the literal meaning of both words. For, although the representatives of science are never weary of reminding us that its so-called "laws," so far as the discoveries of pure observation and experiment go, are nothing more than general expressions of universally recurring and connected facts, yet the persistent use of the word "laws"—drawn by analogy from our own creations in the social and political sphere, where they certainly have behind them not only an enforcing power, but an original cause, in will guided by purpose—witnesses to the intellectual necessity of going beyond or below the mere record of facts, yielded by such observation and experiment, and implies the conviction that these recurrences are strictly "laws"—that is, expressions of some universal and supreme power, which really, though invisibly, reigns. If the word "law" is still to be used in scientific language, it is but right to fix it to its own proper sense ; and in this respect it seems plainly our duty, if we would avoid delusion or ambiguity, to go further still, and contend that no man ought to use the word "laws," with all the associations and inferences that it carries, unless he is prepared to complete the analogy, and acknowledge in the supreme power a supreme will, reigning with design and purpose, both over things and over persons' (p. 5).

We see from this that the point is not argued by the Bishop, as indeed it could not well be, without leading away

from the main scope of the Lectures. The Bishop relies on the obvious meaning of the expression 'reign of Law,' and upon the broad common sense of mankind which cannot help regarding Law in this manner. We think his view is perfectly just; yet it may be well to take into consideration the objections that might be raised by possible opponents. There will be this advantage in doing so, that we may thereby elucidate and establish on firm ground this most important principle.

We can easily see that it might be attacked from the point of view of philosophy. Within the whole range of metaphysics there is not an expression so slippery and so ultimately undefined as that of laws of nature. Under the old philosophy of common sense, laws of nature had a well-defined meaning; but they received a meaning quite different from the philosophy of Hume, which was the parent of the modern sense philosophy. Nothing, in fact, could be more entirely opposite than the meaning of the expression in these two philosophies. Nor does the matter end here; for the philosophy of Kant, which was set up in opposition to Hume, gave a third meaning to the same expression, which was quite different from the two former. We can easily see, therefore, how an opponent who bases himself on one or other of these philosophies, or, what is not uncommon in these discussions, skips from one to the other as suits his purpose—we can easily see how such an opponent might bring out apparently formidable obstacles to the conclusion, or at least might obscure the issue.

But in order to bring out the nature of the opposing argument, it will be best to consider the respective views of these philosophical systems. Of course we cannot attempt anything like a full statement, but we may test them on a single point which bears on the Bishop's argument. What does each of them hold in regard to the attribute of necessity as attaching to laws of nature? We may put the question in this way: Are the laws of nature necessities—that is, necessary entities? To this the Kantian philosopher would reply: Yes, they are in themselves simply necessary. On the other hand, the sense philosopher would say: No, they do not possess the attribute of necessity, but only that of invariability. They are nothing else but the classified invariable recurrences of nature. Inasmuch, however, as the sense philosopher lays the greatest stress upon their invariability, his answer practically comes to the same thing as that of the Kantian. All that he denies is theoretical necessity, contenting himself with the simple statement that as a matter of fact laws of

nature do not vary. Lastly, the answer of the common sense philosopher would be: No, the laws of nature are not in themselves necessary. They indeed possess a relative necessity—relative, that is, to the rest of nature—but, in themselves, they are the appointment of the Creator and subject to His will.

We can thus see the form which a philosophical argument against the Bishop's position might take. The reasoner basing himself on the Kantian rendering, or even on that of the sense philosophy, would argue: No, the laws of nature cannot be the constitution of the Creator or the expression of His will and purpose—for this reason, that they are necessary entities. If a thing is necessary it cannot be the constitution of any mind. Mind can only constitute and arrange things that are contingent. If a thing is necessary, all that we can say of it is that there it is. To this argument there is for the theologian an obvious and easy answer. He might point to the Idealism in which the sense philosophy necessarily issues, or to the Transcendentalism of the Kantian, and finding that their respective views of the laws of nature are necessarily connected with these extremes, he might simply brush aside the argument. He might say these fine theories are all very well in their way. They may serve to amuse those who have a taste for these subtleties, but they have little value for the attainment of truth. As I refuse, on grounds of common sense, to entertain the notions of Idealism or Transcendentalism, so in respect of the laws of nature I take my stand upon common sense, and common sense inevitably regards the laws of nature as the constitution of the Creator and the expression of His will and purpose.

This, however, would be dangerous ground to take up, for in taking it the theologian would lay himself open to a back-handed blow from science. The matter, in fact, is complicated and mixed up with considerations of science. It so happens that in science the expression 'laws of nature' has varied meanings analogous to the varied meanings it takes in philosophy. The laws of number and of geometry, for instance, which form the backbone of the laws of physics, are of a wholly different kind from the laws of chemistry; and both these kinds differ again from the laws of biology. Indeed, in this last case, the difference is so great that biological laws, such as the law of heredity, would not be acknowledged by a strict physicist to be laws of nature at all. He would say of them, they are nothing more than statements of unexplained fact. If, now, we look more closely at this difference,

we find that it lies in the attribute of necessity. Physical laws possess the attribute of strict necessity, while chemical and biological laws do not. It is indeed true in the case of chemistry that with every advance in knowledge its laws have a tendency to advance in the direction of necessity, and some hold that eventually they will attain it. But at present they do not; they stand, as it were, midway between the laws of biology, which are devoid of any perceived necessity, and those of physics, which are strictly necessary.

It is thus seen that a scientific opponent, grounding himself on the necessary laws of physics, might press, from the point of view of science, precisely the same argument as was advanced from the point of view of philosophy. In fact, if we remember rightly, this was exactly the attitude which Professor Tyndall (whose recent loss we so deeply regret) took up in criticizing the late Canon Mozley's Bampton Lectures. It is clear that the argument thus advanced cannot be brushed aside with a high hand. We must meet it fairly, and we will try to do so.

The fallacy, as it appears to us, in both these lines of attack is one of procedure. Both classes of opponents isolate the laws of nature, and consider them solely in themselves. The reasoner first of all explicitly or tacitly forms a conception of what a law of nature is, or he selects from science some particular law which serves the same end, and then he argues from these premisses without considering the relation in which laws of nature stand to other things. We get a very different result if, instead of thus isolating them, we consider them in relation. It is clear to common sense—in fact, nothing could be clearer—that laws of nature are not of an ultimate and independent character. They are not potentates ruling nature with a high hand. On the contrary, they are in the strictest sense dependent entities. Instead of ruling nature, it is nature that rules them. They derive their birth from nature, and are what they are because nature has made them so. Is it not, in fact, clear that the laws of nature depend on the permanent constitution which has been given to the ultimate elements of which nature is composed? The ultimate material elements and the energy which make up nature have been constituted in a certain way; and this being so, this ultimate and permanent constitution regulates and determines the character of all the changes which nature undergoes. In other words, the ultimate constitution of nature gives birth to the laws of nature; for laws of nature are nothing else but the generalized expression of the kinds of change which arise

out of that constitution. Perhaps an example will make this more clear. Let us take the chemical elements, oxygen and hydrogen. It is clear that the laws which govern the behaviour of these elements in chemical circumstances are dependent on the permanent constitution which was originally impressed upon them. Being constituted in a certain way, they necessarily behave in a certain way.

We are thus in a position to refute the arguments which are usually brought against the Bishop's position. Let us recall to mind the form which these arguments take. The laws of nature, it is urged, are necessary, absolutely necessary; they cannot, therefore, be the appointment of any mind, or be the expression of the will and purpose of any mind. But we have seen that the laws of nature are not *absolutely* necessary; they are only *relatively* necessary. They are necessary only on the supposition that nature is constituted in the precise way in which as a matter of fact it is constituted. Had nature been differently constituted they would have been different. Hence, if we suppose for a moment the existence of a Creator, and that nature received its constitution from His hand, it is clear that the laws of nature were within His discretion. He made those laws to be what they are by constituting nature in the way in which it is constituted. He could have made them different by constituting nature differently. Both nature and its laws were thus completely within His discretion, and hence the Bishop's conclusion necessarily follows. The laws of nature being what they are, are the expression of the will and purpose of the Creator.

But from the position we have now gained we are enabled to go a step further towards the re-establishment of the great argument of Natural Theology. Formerly Natural Theology argued from the cosmos as it now exists around us. From the manifest tokens of design visible therein it inferred the existence of an Intelligent Author of nature. The argument was strong, and to our forefathers perfectly conclusive. But science has now shown that the existing cosmos is not, as our forefathers supposed, the primitive form of the solar system. We are taught that the solar system existed first in a nebulous state, that gradually it was differentiated into sun and planets, and that after innumerable ages the earth, the seat of our cosmos, assumed a form which made the economies of animal and vegetable life possible. The cosmos is thus not the immediate constitution of the Creator, but the outcome of a long process extending through the ages. In

consequence of this new doctrine of science many have inferred the destruction of the great argument of Natural Theology—indeed, the destruction of that theological discipline itself. But from the point of view from which we are writing it is easy to see that the fact is not so. The great argument so far from being destroyed has only to accommodate itself to the new state of things: and when this has been done it will be found that not only is its cogency not impaired, but it is even increased. Science having decided that the cosmos is not the primitive form, all that Natural Theology has to do is to argue no longer from the cosmos, but from what is really the primitive state—the primordial constitution of the elements of nature. And if it does so, is not the argument of immense strength? In order to show its real character and strength, let us take an illustration. Let us take as examples the elements of oxygen and hydrogen. It will be admitted that without the water which results from their union the cosmos of animal and vegetable life would have been impossible. Let us ask, then, how it was that these elements came into existence possessed of the constitution which they do possess. To this question Natural Theology can give a reply which is perfectly satisfactory. It tells us that the Creator *intended* the cosmos that was to follow, and therefore constituted not only oxygen and hydrogen, but all the other elements in such a way as to make that cosmos possible.

Of course it is possible to reject this argument; but let us consider the position which anyone rejecting it must necessarily take up. He is obliged to go back to, and assume, a primordial arrangement, and further back in the line of science it is impossible to go. If, therefore, he rejects the idea of an Intelligent Author of nature, what else can he put in its place? What account can he give of this primordial arrangement? He has no account whatever to give. He is face to face with the most stupendous event which ever took place, and he must either believe it to be *uncaused*, which is downright scientific heresy, or else he must believe it to be *inscrutable*, which is downright scientific treason.

We should like next to make some remarks on the third Lecture. It is one of the most important, inasmuch as it considers the relation in which the Christian dispensation stands to the general order or process of the world in time. The Christian dispensation teaches that in the fulness of time God sent forth His Son; that is to say, in other words, God Himself in the fulness of time became incarnate in humanity. And this

Incarnation was nothing else than a new creation; it was the inauguration of a new state of things—a state of things leading up to another intervention in the world of humanity, an intervention which will be the consummation of all things when the Son of God again appears. How does this teaching stand to the order of things observed in the natural world? Is it out of harmony with what we see there? Is it an after-thought, an abrupt sudden interference with an order of things established and perfect in itself? Or, is it in harmony with the ways of nature? Does it fit in and become a part or element in the great external order? Or, in other words, does it follow in sequence to similar elevations to a higher state which have taken place in the past? Is it, as such an elevation, the completion and consummation of what has gone before, so that the order of nature without it would be incomplete and wholly purposeless, leading to nothing?

The author addresses himself to this great question, and in doing so he accepts and endorses the doctrine of Evolution. It is chiefly on the fact of this acceptance that we wish to remark, and with this view let us first explain the position he takes up. He states the doctrine in this way. The order of the world, he tells us, is one continuous growth; and in this growth 'the higher and more complex forms of existence follow and depend upon the lower and simpler forms' (p. 88). Then, again, the change from lower to higher is gradual. There is a 'gradual transition from the indeterminate to the determinate, from the uniform to the varied,' from 'the homogeneous to the heterogeneous' (*ibid.*). Next we are told that this process of evolution may be traced with some distinctness through each distinct province—the world of inorganic matter, the world of life, the world of humanity; and it is partly seen, partly surmised, that the developments in all are correlated to one another successively or contemporaneously, so that the growth of the whole world is thus embraced in one great universal theory.

But, though the author thus accepts the theory of Evolution, still it is with considerable misgiving, and with very considerable abatements; and it is worth our while to look at these abatements. It would appear that the term Evolution itself in relation both to its history and etymology is of doubtful accuracy; and, that being so, the author thinks it unfortunate that the word should still be used. For, referring to Coleridge, he reminds us that errors of nomenclature are apt to avenge themselves by errors of idea. And, in point of fact, as regards Evolution, both advocates and opponents,

while rejecting doctrines which the word seems to imply, are apt to glide into lines of argument which presuppose these doctrines. This is, to say the least, a somewhat discouraging commencement; nor is the matter at all mended when we go on to consider those doctrines, implied in the term, against which we must carefully guard ourselves. In the first place, we are told that, although the name Evolution seems to imply it, still we are to guard ourselves against the supposition that all the properties of the higher forms of being were contained implicitly in the simpler forms which preceded them. Thus, for instance, we are not to suppose that life and consciousness were contained in inorganic matter, or (as it was once rhetorically put) human genius and moral aspiration were present implicitly in a 'ring of cosmical vapour.' This abatement of the Bishop's is to us somewhat startling, for it seems to take from Evolution its very substance and *raison d'être*. Evolution means literally unfolding: how can a thing be unfolded unless it is first there, at least in embryo? Or, looking at Evolution as a theory of the world process, its primary analogy is the process of the Egg and the Chicken. If this process is applied analogically to explain the great world process, it follows necessarily that the fiery cloud contained the 'promise and potency' of all things. The Chicken is implicitly contained in the Egg, and grows out from the Egg; and hence, if the analogy holds, the whole cosmos was implicitly contained in the fiery cloud, and grew out from the fiery cloud. Do not the high priests of Evolution teach so? Let us listen to Dr. Huxley. He, at least, is a very competent authority; and he has stated the whole doctrine in a pregnant sentence, often quoted, and become almost classical. Dr. Huxley says, 'The more purely a mechanist the speculator is, the more firmly must he assume a primordial molecular arrangement of which all the phenomena of the universe are the consequence.'¹ This famous sentence, while it leaves open the question of a primordial creation, yet absolutely excludes the idea of subsequent creative additions. The primordial creation or arrangement was of such a character that *all the phenomena of the universe* flowed from it by the great law of Evolution. Nor, indeed, can we conceive how it could be otherwise, if we are to hold by Evolution at all.

But the Bishop not only runs counter to the first half of Dr. Huxley's sentence, he is equally at variance with the second. He brings forward as his second abatement the plea

¹ Quoted p. 93. It was first printed, if we remember aright, in the *Academy*.

that Evolution must not be supposed to carry with it, as is often assumed, the conviction that the sole cause of the world process is immanent in the world. In other words, he cannot accept the doctrine that the cosmos has been evolved out of the primordial arrangement by the sole unaided action of natural causes. He sets against this idea the doctrine of an original creative Mind at once immanent and transcendent, who first brought into being physical nature, and subsequently has guided and determined its progress in time by a never-failing Providence. But what, we may well ask, remains of Evolution after this second abatement has been made? By the first he showed that Evolution is impossible without a primordial creation and subsequent creative additions; by the second he shows that the very process of Evolution, on which all true Evolutionists pride themselves, is inadequate, unless we bring in a Higher Power to guide and control it. Under these circumstances, what is Evolution but a lame duck which cannot walk? It must, in truth, be confessed that the courteous and kindly Bishop has treated our old friend Evolution in much the same way as the thieves treated the wayfaring man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho. He has *stripped him of his raiment and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead.*

But, in truth, the matter is very serious. We have seen that the Bishop repudiates the substance of Evolution—that he, in fact, substitutes for Evolution a process of nature guided and controlled by the Creator. Any student of philosophy can see at a glance that the Bishop's doctrine is not only opposed to, but is the exact antithesis of, the doctrine of Evolution. And yet the Bishop retains the name. Is this a prudent course to take in view of the welfare of souls? Is there not great peril to souls in doing so? The Bishop himself has pointed out that even experts are often betrayed by the name of Evolution into presupposing doctrines which they explicitly reject. Will not the same danger attach to the young, the inexperienced, the unthinking, in even a higher degree if we teach them the doctrine of Evolution in modified form? As many of our modern teachers seem strangely blind to this peril, we should like to bring it out in its full extent by pointing out what Evolution really is, and how it stands related to previous systems.

Throughout the history of philosophy there have always existed two opposing systems. On the one hand, we have what we may call, in a general way, the philosophy of freedom, the best representative of which is the Theism of the Bible.

On the other hand, we have, as the antithesis of this, what may be called in a general way the philosophy of necessity. The philosophy of freedom—that is, in other words, Theism—has remained essentially unchanged from the beginning; the philosophy of necessity, on the other hand, is remarkable for the manifold forms which it has assumed. It is, in truth, essentially unstable—for this reason, that it never can complete itself, as Theism can, in a rounded system. Hence the constant changes it undergoes. Sometimes it takes the form of Pantheism, of which we have had in recent times a succession of systems; sometimes, again, it takes the form of Materialism, of which also there are many kinds, some of a grosser and some of a more refined sort. Now Evolution is nothing else but the most recent rendering of this philosophy of the Left. But the point of most importance in the present connexion is the respective teaching of these two philosophies. It is simply this. On the one hand, Theism exalts man, it vindicates his moral freedom, it encourages him to look up to a Higher Power and onward to a future life. On the other hand, the philosophy of necessity degrades man, it denies to him all moral freedom, and destroys belief in God and in a future life. What, therefore, will happen if we, Christian teachers, go on patronizing Evolution? Simply this. Our pupils, if they are at all interested in the matter, will naturally go somewhere for further information, and this is what they will find. If they go to the high priests of Evolution they will find the *premisses* of these sinister doctrines, so disastrous to spiritual and moral life, firmly insisted on. Or if, as is more likely, they go to one or other of the numerous expounders who hang around the skirts of science, they will find the doctrines themselves drawn out in all the fulness of detail. It may, indeed, be said an antidote is provided in the theistic rendering of Evolution given by the Bishop and others. It is, however, to be remembered that Theism is out of place and incongruous when thus united with its opposite, and we very much doubt whether it could long hold its ground, under these circumstances, against the full flood of evolutionary doctrine. It must be remembered, too, that this philosophy of the Left has a singular power over many minds. It appeals strongly to human nature, and constitutes a strong temptation. It is, in truth, to man's intellectual nature what sin is to his moral nature; and, that being the case, the only safe course for the Christian teacher is to anathematize it, both name and thing.¹

¹ As a specimen of the kind of teaching the young and inexperienced

But it may be said Evolution is a doctrine of science, and therefore must be accepted as such. It is quite true that Evolution poses before the world as a great scientific discovery. But this pretension cannot for a moment be admitted, and for this good reason, that all the facts of science on which Evolution bases itself are equally congenial to and equally admitted by Theism. It is true that Evolution when it first came before the world possessed an advantage over Theism, inasmuch as it advocated the continuity of causes in the great world process, which was then denied by Theism. But this advantage has now passed away from it. Intelligent Theism now proclaims the continuity of causes just as emphatically as Evolution. The truth is, that the old doctrine of 'interpositions,' applied largely in geology, previous to Lyell, in the shape of 'creative rearrangements' and so on, is now seen to have been a very crude conception. It presupposed that *as a rule* nature is left to itself; it held that God intervenes only on special occasions; and that when He does so, it is by interposing between causes and their effects. But plainly this doctrine is unworthy both of God and of nature. The action of God's Providence ought not to be conceived as intermittent, but as continuous; nor ought God to be conceived as influencing nature by suspending its laws, or displacing its effects, but from a wholly different quarter. It is by a continuous never-ceasing influence exerted from behind

are likely to meet with from Evolutionists, we give the following. A writer in the *Fortnightly Review* thus sums up the teaching of his article:

'The material universe is infinite and eternal, all its changes being the result of all-pervading and eternally unchanging Laws.

'Life and consciousness, whatever may be their nature, are inseparable from this material universe; they follow its laws, and are the results of its laws. They are another aspect of the movements of the same machine.

'Such life and consciousness as we see exhibited in man is a fleeting and infinitesimal phenomenon in the eternity and the infinity of this All.

'No purpose that to human reason seems rational can be discovered by human reason in man's circumstances and history—certainly not any benevolent purpose; and as to the universe as a whole, no meaning or purpose in it is even conjecturable.

'The universe is eternal; freedom is unthinkable; purpose is undiscoverable; the hypothesis of a designer is unnecessary. Such is the verdict of natural reason applied scientifically.'

The writer characterizes the above as 'certain broad generalizations, the truth of which modern science is daily branding into the consciousness of civilized man'; if he had said 'Evolution is daily branding, &c.,' he would have been nearer the mark. The above is, in fact, a fair statement of the doctrines of Evolution as popularly understood (*Fortnightly Review*, September 1890, p. 368).

the veil that the great process of nature is controlled and guided, and that the Divine Will and Purpose is impressed upon it. Thus the difference between Evolution and Theism is not a difference of objective or scientific fact, but a difference of interpretation. Theism gives one interpretation of it, Evolution another. Or, rather, it would be more true to say, while Theism gives a rational explanation of the origin of the world and its onward progress, Evolution has no explanation whatever to offer; it attributes the whole to chance.

We have hitherto argued against Evolution from the point of view of the injury it inflicts upon religion. It may help towards the acceptance of our view if we next point out that it is equally injurious to science. As a theory it is, in fact, at the present moment a serious obstacle to the advance of science. And this hindrance it effects by prejudging many points of vast importance in science, which are not yet established by strict scientific proof. We may give as an illustration of this the Darwinian doctrine, that all the species of plants and animals have been developed out of one or more primitive germs. This doctrine, if it could be scientifically established, would be very congenial to Theism; for it would bring home to us, in a way that probably nothing else could do, the continuous never-ceasing care of God over His creation. For the Darwinian doctrine presupposes that during innumerable ages a series of external arrangements, coming after each other in a vast succession, have been correlated to another series of changes going on within the sphere of life. These arrangements and their correlations, often of the most elaborate description, have in succession to each other all pointed in one direction, the elevation of life to ever higher spheres. Of this marvellous phenomenon Theism could give a very rational explanation in assigning as its cause the continuous care and guidance of God. Evolution, on the other hand, can give no account at all; it is obliged to attribute it to happy chance! Unfortunately, however, this Darwinian position is not scientifically established. Many biologists think it can never be established—that, in fact, it is not the true explanation. And they bring forward against it many formidable objections drawn from geologic history. But Evolution has prejudged the whole case; it affirms that it is and must be true; it affirms that no other view of the origin of species is possible. Hence scientific inquirers who are votaries of Evolution have no choice. They must spend their whole time in searching for scientific proof of a foregone conclusion—a search which may prove altogether vain

and illusory. Had they been able, as under the free Theistic theory they would have been able, to keep an open mind, and to look all around them, the progress of Biology might have been far greater.

But there is a far more serious indictment against Evolution in the confusion and error which it has spread over the whole surface of modern culture. The Bishop has said of Evolution: 'The process is traced with some distinctness through each distinct province—the world of inorganic matter, the world of life, the world of humanity.' We have here the very head and front of the offence committed by this sinister theory; we have here the source of all the confusion and error which it has introduced into modern culture. Let us for a moment look closely at the facts. We have first of all the process of the Egg and the Chicken. That, we may admit, is a real growth, or, if you like, a real Evolution. Next we have the grand Darwinian process of the development of species out of one or more primitive germs. Let it be observed that in this second process every condition, every force, the onward movement itself, and that on which it abuts, is utterly, entirely different, as different as any two things could well be. Yet that, too, is growth—that, too, is Evolution. Next we have the great Cosmic process, in which all the conditions and all the forces are not terrestrial but cosmic, and in which the onward movement differs altogether from anything which could take place on the earth's surface. Yet that is growth, that also is Evolution. Next we have the process of humanity, the development of culture, of civilization, of art, science, religion, and morality. Here, again, all the conditions are utterly different from any of the other processes. Here altogether new forces come into play, forces which have no analogy whatever in the physical world. Yet this, too, is growth—this, too, is Evolution.

We ask, could anything be more confusing than this assemblage of things utterly different into one great heap? Could anything be the parent of more serious error? For the theory is that the process is the same in all. Consequently, if that be so, ideas gained from the study of one process may be transferred into another. And this is exactly what takes place, to the great injury of knowledge and of truth. It is true there is comparatively little danger from this transference in the processes of objective nature, for the great facts of these objective processes are always there, and they place a limit on the extravagances of the theory. It is very different, however, in the sphere of humanity. Here the facts are not

present. They have faded away into the dim region of the past, and we only know them by scanty fragments that have come down to us. Here there is no obstacle to the full play of evolutionary ideas. And so on this sphere the theory has run riot. Instead of piecing together with an open mind, and by a slow and painful process, the fragments of early human history, and letting the results speak for themselves, the evolutionist carries his theory bodily into primitive times. He *assumes* that for every human development there was a germ; he *assumes* that this germ grew by certain stages, and in a certain way; and he brushes aside every fact which seems to point to a different conclusion. Thus we have a highly artificial picture of human progress; and the history of any primitive people can be done to order. We have a very notable example of this in the higher criticism of the Old Testament. The process of the Egg and the Chicken is violently read into the Bible. It is made the standard whereby we are to measure God's providential government of His people, and His revelation of Himself to them; and everything in the Bible which conflicts with this rendering is pronounced to be interpolation or anachronism.

It is surely much to be deprecated that a theory so destructive, as we have shown it to be, of all spiritual and moral life—a theory which, from a philosophical point of view, is truncated and impossible—a theory which has introduced into modern culture such confusion and error—should be patronized by the Christian theologian. It may be said, he believes, and therefore he speaks; but can't he, for Christ's sake, hold his tongue? The time will surely come, and we believe is not far distant, when the eyes of the general public will be open to the absurdity of this great craze. And who is it that will then be pilloried? Not, we may be very sure, the authors and the ringleaders of Evolution, but the too complaisant Christian theologian who, with considerable misgiving, has followed in their wake.

ART. II.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AND MODERN CRITICISM.

1. *Old Testament Theology.* By Dr. HERMANN SCHULTZ, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. Translated from the fourth German Edition by the Rev. J. A. PATERSON. (Edinburgh, 1892.)
2. *Old Testament Theology.* By ARCHIBALD DUFF, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Theology in the Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford. (London and Edinburgh, 1891.)

THE press continues to pour forth volumes of various descriptions on the Old Testament. Anything like an exhaustive study of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant which shall combine English sobriety and judgment with German industry and inventiveness, is not, we fear, to be expected just yet. The criticism of the critics has no doubt commenced, and we are pleased to observe a little abatement of the confidence with which their opinions are expressed. But no scholar of sufficient mark has as yet appeared, either in England or abroad, to deal satisfactorily with Hebrew history and literature on the unassailable principles laid down in his recent most important charge by that master in historical science, the Bishop of Oxford.

The second of the volumes at the head of this article need not detain us long. It proceeds on the same lines as the first, but with less originality, and, it appears to us, with very considerably less success. It is an endeavour to estimate the character of Hebrew theology from an analysis of the contents of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. It concludes at the opening of the reign of Josiah, at 'the eve of events of great moment,' of 'outer experiences' which 'will be found to be the occasion of notable spiritual advance, enlargement of interest, deepening of character, great sharpening of insight into the realities of God and of life' (pp. 331, 332). The history commences at the year 800 B.C. Professor Duff, in his introductory matter, explains why this is so. He regards Professor Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, and Professor Cheyne's Bampton Lectures for 1889 on *The Origin of the Psalter* as 'marking an epoch in Biblical study in this country.' The work of the latter he describes as 'magnificent,' because 'so eloquent and so rich in stores of learning' (p. vii). He is, therefore, to be regarded as accept-

ing the conclusions of these scholars. The Pentateuch and other narrative books, he remarks, 'are all placed first in the Christian Old Testament' (p. 3). 'The very first result of any thoughtful reading in it is the discovery of remarkable art in its construction.' 'It is at once strikingly poetical, and also decidedly philosophical.' Consequently, 'the criticism is no task for beginners' (p. 4). The 'wondrous old fabric, pricelessly precious, forbids in venerable solemnity the rude touch of the ignorant' (p. 5). It will be seen from this that Dr. Duff's style leaves something to be desired.

But he goes on to tell us that 'the study of the Pentateuch demands preliminary knowledge, independently gained, of the main course of the history of the Hebrew people's religious life' (*ibid.*). There can be no objection to this proposition. If doubts have been expressed about the date of the Pentateuch in its present shape, no wiser course could possibly be adopted than to scrutinize the works of the earliest religious teachers of Israel, and to ascertain what formed the basis of their exhortation. It is this which gives its value to Professor James Robertson's admirable volume on *The Early Religion of Israel*. But a great deal depends upon the way in which the investigation is carried on. If it is an honest endeavour to ascertain what religious ideas were current in the age when the earlier prophets wrote, and what may reasonably be supposed to be the sources of those ideas, then nothing but profit can arise from the investigation. But if the investigator approach his subject with preconceived opinions; if the only object he has in view be a negative one; if he be chiefly anxious to prove that the 'Torah' of which the prophet speaks is not the one which has been handed down to us; if he absolutely refuses to recognize the fact that a moral code of great authority and of considerable antiquity must have existed at the time when the prophets in question wrote—then the result is likely to be confusion worse confounded. For instead of trying to find out *how much* the prophets inherited—the object of every sound historical critic—his endeavour will be to find out *how little*. And the result, instead of being an exhaustive analysis of the religious ideas of Israel in the year 800 B.C., will be a grudging attempt to reduce those religious ideas to a *minimum*. The miracle of the crossing of the Jordan is repeated. The waters of history 'fail and are cut off' at their source, and the critic passes over dryshod into a land of critical 'milk and honey.'

When we turn to Professor Duff's pages for a solution of these problems we do not, it must be confessed, find much

assistance. He has plenty of fine phrases at our service. 'All agree,' he tells us, that 'the Pentateuch is a splendid literary fact, a magnificent literary structure, a finely fascinating literary work.' We must confess that this is not exactly the impression produced upon us by the analysis of it into its component parts which we have found in the pages of Wellhausen and Kuenen. A book compiled in such a fashion that it is an easy task, at this distance of time, to recognize its various writers by their inconsistencies, their incongruities of narrative and style, can hardly be described as a literary success. But Professor Duff skates very cautiously around the dangerous places of the recent theories in regard to the Pentateuch. So far as these theories are concerned, he does not go beyond the questionable assertion that תורת משה does not mean Law of Moses, but 'Divine instruction concerning deliverance' (p. 24). In regard to the rest, he wisely confines himself to very cautious generalities. We cannot say that we have found his analysis of the prophetic teaching either very striking or very profitable. But this may possibly be because the present volume is only the first of a series, and it may be premature to judge of the merits of Professor Duff's analysis until we have its entire results before us.

The reputation Dr. Schultz has attained, both on the Continent and in England, entitles his book to great attention. And the opinions he has expressed on some points are, as we shall see presently, especially noteworthy. Professor Paterson's translation possesses one great and unusual advantage. It has been submitted to the author, and is declared by him to have been executed 'with as much skill as care,' and to have 'given the meaning of the original with the utmost accuracy,' although there has been no slavishly literal adherence to the German idiom.

We should naturally be prepared to expect that Professor Schultz would be opposed to any theory of the literal inspiration of the Bible. Accordingly, we shall find him starting with the declaration that in an examination of the theological teaching of the Old Testament 'we cannot assume, without further inquiry, that the religious and moral material which we find there must be everywhere uniform in character, or even equally excellent' (i. 2). It has been too often tacitly assumed that the whole Bible is homogeneous in moral and spiritual character. And the assumption, though seldom definitely formulated, has nevertheless done a considerable amount of mischief. The contrary proposition is not even matter for inference; it is directly asserted in Holy Scripture itself.

Had the revelation of God made to the Patriarchs contained all necessary theological truth, there had been no place for the Law. Had the Law provided for all the religious needs of mankind, there had been no place for the Prophets. Had the Prophets supplied all that was lacking in previous revelations of God's will, there had been no need of a Gospel. But the Law—so St. Paul tells us—was needed by those to whom the patriarchal dispensation had been given, 'because of transgressions';¹ and it was 'our schoolmaster, to bring us to Christ.'² 'God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.'³ And that Son, in His Sermon on the Mount, claimed the right to expand, modify, and even abrogate the provisions of the Law, since 'in the dispensation of the fulness of the times' He had come to 'make known' to man the mystery of the Divine Will.⁴ Thus we must not only be prepared to make, but we are bound to make, the admission that in the earlier revelations of that Will many things will be found which are not merely imperfect, but even unsatisfactory, when viewed in the light of the fuller manifestation of the Divine purpose under which we are now living.

Professor Schultz, however, while he rightly regards Biblical criticism as a most important part of the investigation into the moral and religious ideas of the Old Testament, is very far from thinking that any very definite results have as yet been obtained. 'Even where there is essential agreement as to the true principles of criticism, there are still many details,' he thinks, 'especially in reference to the Pentateuch and the Psalms, that are extremely debatable.' 'Despite the many valuable contributions by painstaking investigators of proved ability which recent years have brought us' (and here the Professor mentions Baudissin, Riehm, Kautzsch, Duhm, and the contributors to the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* and the *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*), 'Science has still plenty of work before her' (i. 4). It is important to learn on such high authority that the questions which have been raised in the science of Biblical criticism cannot yet be considered as settled, and we are rejoiced to be able to quote Professor Schultz in support of the protest which the *Church Quarterly Review* has all along raised against the attempt to force upon the Christian Church conjectures which as yet have not been thoroughly examined, and theories which have by no means

¹ Gal. iii. 19.² Gal. iii. 24.³ Heb. i. 1, 2.⁴ Eph. i. 9, 10.

been fully proved, as the final conclusions of modern critical science.

We next enter upon the important question how far Old Testament theology and 'systematized Evangelical' doctrine can be assumed to be coincident. And here the Professor shall speak for himself, and give those whose duty it is to expound the Scriptures a warning which it is very necessary that they should lay to heart.

'The distinction between these two branches of study is, in the first place, one of *form*. Systematic theology has to present in one harmonious whole the moral and religious consciousness of an evangelical Christian of the present day, as based on the completed development of the Bible, and on the ecclesiastical history of Christendom resulting therefrom. Biblical theology has to show, from a purely historical standpoint, what were the doctrinal views and moral ideas which animated the leading spirits of our religion during the Biblical period of its growth. In the next place, the distinction is one of *contents*. What Biblical theology shows to have been the religious and moral contents of any particular period of Biblical development, is by no means proved thereby to be a doctrine of Christian faith or morals. It is but a single step in the process of that development which was leading onwards to the perfecting of religion in Christianity. Now, the law of organic development is, that in every stage of healthy development all future developments are already lying hid, but hid only—as germs are. Hence in the product of each stage in the Biblical religion, the germ of the last and highest stage was present, but still only in the germ. It is only the man of science, to whom the life history of a plant is familiar, that can recognise in the germ its relation to the coming bloom and fruit, never the superficial observer' (i. 5, 6).

In chapter ii. the Professor treats of the character of Old Testament literature, which he describes as 'including every form of literary production found among the Hebrews,' with the exception of 'purely dogmatic or philosophical teaching' (i. 15). The list of authorities on each branch of the subject is a useful feature of this, as it is of other German works. The historical books are very naturally regarded, from the present standpoint reached by the critics, as a problem of considerable difficulty. Their historical credibility has been disputed, and cannot therefore be assumed. Where they are written by those who 'were qualified by personal position, or from possessing original documents, to form an historically trustworthy judgment regarding the things narrated by them' (i. 17), we can accept their authority. But which of our narratives are so written? Here, we cannot but feel, the author falls into the error which he himself deprecates. He regards

questions as settled which as yet are *sub judice*. Thus he speaks of the 'oldest form' of Judges and the 'main document' in Ezra and Nehemiah. But historical and literary critics of great eminence—the Bishop of Oxford, for instance—are not convinced that it is possible to effect authoritatively the separation of an historical document into its component parts on critical grounds alone. And other persons who, though not experts, are familiar with scientific methods—very often far more familiar with them than many who *are* experts in the particular branch of study we are now considering—refuse to accept the methods of critics as conclusive until they have been applied successfully to some known case. So far from having been thus verified, these methods, it is contended, can be shown in many cases to have entirely failed. Thus the presumption, instead of being in their favour, is against them. And more especially are they to be distrusted when there is reason to suspect that they are employed in support of a foregone conclusion, such as the non-Mosaic origin of the Book of Leviticus, and of other provisions of the so-called Mosaic Law. Again, when we are told that the Book of Chronicles is 'without value for an inquiry into the religion of Hezekiah's time, not to speak of David's' (p. 17), we are admitting a principle which, if men were so disposed, would sweep away whole volumes of Ecclesiastical History, from those of Eusebius and Bede to those of Dean Milman and Canon Dixon.

When Professor Schultz speaks of the early history of Israel as 'legend,' it is almost a relief to those who are familiar with recent German and English criticism. For, as he very justly adds, 'in legend there is invariably an historical kernel' (i. 18). But of late it has seemed the delight of critics to extract that historical kernel, and to throw it away. When Abraham is presented to us by Wellhausen as a 'free creation of unconscious art,' excogitated subsequently to Isaac and Jacob; when we are told that Moses had nothing to do with Israelite institutions, with the single exception, perhaps, of the Ten Commandments; when the legend, if it be no more, of David as 'the sweet Psalmist of Israel,' is summarily rejected; it is a satisfaction to find a writer of importance in Germany falling back on what has until lately been regarded as a commonplace of historical criticism. Let it at least be remembered, when, in deference to the authority of the critic, we have dismissed all the most important figures in Israelite history into the *limbo* of exploded fictions, that Professor Schultz has said, 'Whoever, for *dogmatic reasons* [the italics are ours] questions the existence of such "legends" in the Old Testament, must

assume that Israel's legendary history has been lost to us, and that, in the sacred writers, its place has been taken by a knowledge of history miraculously acquired' (i. 19). It is true that the Professor is speaking of those who deny the existence of legend in the interests of orthodoxy. But it is equally true of those who deny the existence of the historical germ in the interests of heterodoxy. Those who refuse to admit the germ of truth which legend, according to Professor Schultz, 'invariably' contains, must either altogether repudiate the history as it has come down to us, or believe that the history was miraculously revealed to writers in the days of Hezekiah, Josiah, or Ezra.

But the Professor is a little too positive that 'the time of which they treat' is a 'sufficient proof' of the legendary character even of the pre-Mosaic narratives (i. 25). He has ventured to assert that 'it was a time prior to all knowledge of writing.' Yet we find inscriptions in the ruins of the city of Ur itself, which competent critics assign to an age prior to that of Abraham. That legend has intermingled with the story of the Flood—that it is to be found in the narratives of the Fall, the murder of Abel, and the history of Noah—it is more difficult to deny. But none the less are we bound to be on the watch against unproved assertions, such as that 'when writing had come into use, in the time, that is, between Moses and David, it would be but sparingly used' (p. 26), especially when we find evidence to the contrary in the ancient records of Egypt and Babylon, and even, as the tablets at Tel-el-Amarna demonstrate, in Palestine itself. And so, too, the resolution of history into myth or legend on the 'eponymic' system, is a treatment of the subject which experience has shown to be at least hazardous.

After a passage in which the various theories in regard to the relation of the Old Testament to the New are summarized, we reach the author's view of Old Testament monotheism:

'But the monotheism of the Old Testament is essentially practical. It does not at first lay stress on there *being only one God*, but on the duty of Israel *to have only one God*. Indeed the more recent estimate of Israel's religion sees, not without good reason, in the conscious monotheism which distinguishes Israel from the kindred peoples, a tolerably late development of Old Testament religion. Besides, a monotheism is imaginable, and in fact exists, which as a nature-worship is at least as far removed from the Old Testament idea of God as, for instance, the moral polytheism of the religion of Olympus. Consequently monotheism as such is not a suitable term by which to define the religion of the Old Testament' (i. 34, 35).

It is somewhat difficult to understand why Israel should be told that it is his duty to have only one God, except on the ground that there is no other. 'I am Jehovah, there is none else,' is a sentiment frequently found in Scripture.¹ That the Israelites, down even to St. Paul's day,² believed that the gods of the heathen were real beings is unquestionable. But the point which Professor Schultz, with many others, has lost sight of is this, Were they in any sense the equals of the Being Israel was taught to worship? Was not the sin of worshipping them believed to consist in the fact that they were demons, and not in any proper sense gods at all? 'They worshipped Baal-peor, and offered their sons and their daughters to devils.'³ 'As for the gods of the heathen, they are but idols; but it is Jehovah Who made the heavens.'⁴ Such are the repeated statements in the Psalms, which represent the *lex orandi*, and therefore the creed, of the Israelitish race.⁵ We are told, no doubt, that the first chapter of Genesis was written at the climax, and not at the opening, of Israel's religious development. But it is by no means proved as yet that this was the case. There is ground for believing that this conception of God as the creator and sole ruler of heaven as well as earth, was from the very first the doctrine taught to the Israelites, and that it was in its nature incompatible with the acceptance of any other God. For the belief that Jehovah was originally regarded simply as the mightiest among a crowd of similar beings there is not a shadow of foundation in Holy Writ.

Professor Schultz, however, does not doubt that 'the people of Israel had a real national life before Moses.' 'Indeed,' he adds (i. 61), 'we may confidently assume' that 'when Moses appeared the better among the people already had a religion which could serve as a basis of the Mosaic.' 'Otherwise Moses could never have gathered a whole down-trodden people around the standard of his newly-revealed religion, or have succeeded in spite of the Egyptians in evoking such popular enthusiasm for it.' He quotes Mohammed, as the founder of what was practically a new

¹ See Is. xlii. 8, xliii. 11, xlv. 5, 14, 21, 22. Also Exod. xv. 11; Deut. iii. 24, xxxii. 4; Ps. xxxv. 10, lxxi. 19, xcvi. 3.

² 1 Cor. viii. 5.

³ Ps. cvi. 37; שדים, especially distinguished from God (Eloah) in Deut. xxxii. 17.

⁴ Ps. xcvi. 5, אֱלִילִים, things of nought. What the heathen idea of their gods was, and how fundamentally opposed to the Hebrew conception, is shown by Elijah's mocking speech in 1 Kings xviii. 27.

⁵ See Ps. viii. 3, xix. 1, xxxiii. 6, xc. 1, xciii. 2, xcvi. 1-9, cix., cxv. 15, 16. These are not prerogatives which can be shared by any other being.

religion, as an example of the difficulties with which Moses would have had to contend had there not been some foundation of faith at least for him to build upon. But it is a little difficult to understand from the Professor's pages, or indeed from the pages of any other writer of his school, in what this religious basis consisted.

We next come to Professor Schultz's view of the documents. He accepts the 'four main streams of tradition' of which we have heard so much of late. And he accepts the curious theory which makes the Elohist a writer from Northern Israel. Had it been so there would have been small chance that the Elohist document would have been embodied in a work written by and for Jews after the defection of the Ten Tribes. But he takes a decidedly independent line in regard to the date of the Jehovistic document, which he calls 'B.' He is compelled, with Tuch, to deny that it is so late as the eighth century B.C. 'The religious horizon is not so wide, nor is the religious diction by any means so full, as in the case even of Hosea.' And 'there is nowhere found in the book any definite reference to the hopes of the Davidic dynasty, nor is any attention paid to Zion as the central sanctuary.' It is true that he adds the extremely questionable assertion that the holy places against the worship at which 'Amos and Hosea are already fighting with passionate zeal' are to the Jehovist 'objects of perfectly unembarrassed joy and admiration' (i. 65). But there is at all events enough here to show us how far we are from that 'agreement of the critics' on which so much stress is laid, even on so elementary a question as that of the date of our authorities. Professor Driver tells us that our first documents are of the age of Ahaz or thereabouts. With Professor Schultz one of them at least is pre-Davidic. It is certain therefore that the time has not yet arrived for an authoritative reconstruction of Hebrew history. And when we add that Professor Schultz, unlike most recent critics, regards the first Elohist as later than the Jehovist, we have made it tolerably clear that reasonable men should wait until the critical oracle has spoken out a little more plainly.

In regard to the Priestly Code, which he calls A, Professor Schultz describes it as

'a thoroughly homogeneous work, constructed on a well-arranged plan, and for the most part preserved with such care by the editors of the Pentateuch that in combining it with other books it is only occasionally that even single words and sentences have had to be sacrificed. Its object was to bring vividly before the reader's mind

the origin of the sacred customs and the religious possessions of the people. It therefore begins with the God Elohim, who becomes to the patriarchs El Schaddai, and to Moses Jehovah. In the first place it represents the Sabbath and the command to abstain from blood as sacred customs originally binding upon all mankind, and circumcision as a custom common to the descendants of Abraham. It next shows us in broad outline how the sacred institutions of Israel took their rise under Moses, especially the law of sacrifice in its most artistic development, and also the origin of the festal year as based on the Sabbath, and of the holy place, which is represented in most ideal completeness by the tabernacle. It next carries us past the death of Moses to the settlement of Israel in Canaan, which is in like manner represented as ideally complete, the tribes portioning out the whole land among themselves in an equitable and peaceful manner. It comes to a close in the time of the Judges, although it may originally have gone farther, or at least have been intended to go farther. Written in a simple, lucid style, without any special force or grandeur of diction, it invariably becomes diffuse when dealing with anything that is important from the standpoint of ritual or of law. It may therefore be considered the work of a priest' (i. 72, 73).

It would have been well if Professor Schultz had dwelt a little more fully on this branch of his argument. For it is at least possible that the supposed priestly writer 'becomes diffuse' on points connected with ritual and law, simply because the critics have thought fit to attribute to him all the ritual and legal formularies drawn up in precise language in the Pentateuch. There is absolutely not the slightest evidence for the theory which identifies the author of Leviticus with the author of those passages only in the historical parts of the Pentateuch which are attributed to the priestly writer. Professor Schultz regards it as 'certain' that the arrangements presupposed in the Priestly Code 'were not known in the time of the earlier prophets.' Neither the Elohist, Jehovist, or Deuteronomist, he asserts, had any knowledge of them. 'The book is the work of a priest who, undeterred by the existence of sanctuaries in Israel, has presented us with his ideal of sacred customs in the form of a history of the development of religious ritual in Israel.' That is to say, he has deliberately falsified history in order to disseminate his ideas, and his falsification has been accepted without question by the Israelites of his day, and has been handed down without dispute as a true account of their institutions. In other words, he is a kind of Jewish pseudo-Isidore. When evidence has been adduced to show that similar falsifications of their plainest historical traditions, and of their fundamental religious institutions, have been accepted by other nations, it will be

time enough to consider their probability in the case of the Jews. Otherwise we must consider them, by however many German scholars soever they may be supported, as on a level, in point of credibility, with assertions that the institutions of Lycurgus and Solon were subsequent to the Peloponnesian war, or that the principles of Roman law were introduced after the days of Julius Cæsar. Even the pseudo-Isidorean decretals, though they have been accepted and acted upon by a large portion of the Church of Christ, can be shown, and have been shown, to be forgeries by a reference to writings of earlier date. And be it remembered that Israelite history is by no means silent as to the duty of worship at the one sanctuary. That silence is only obtained by the deliberate removal from our documents of every passage in which it is broken. Either, therefore, the history has been falsified in the most deliberate and daring manner that has ever been known, or the worship at the one sanctuary was one of the original provisions of the Mosaic Law, and the neglect to observe it was always regarded by consistent disciples of that law as the cause of Israel's subsequent misfortunes.

In chapter vii., on the Pre-Mosaic Age, we are introduced to the Professor's description of the Old Testament view of Abraham. There is no reason to take exception to it, save that it pretends to distinguish between the idea of Abraham presented in the fused narrative of the Elohists and Jehovists, and that given in the Priestly Code. In the latter, the 'Patriarch's figure is rather indistinct.' 'Indeed the whole patriarchal tradition has for A [the Priestly Code] quite a subordinate significance as compared with "the Law"' (i. 95). Here our author departs from the principle he has laid down (i. 18), that there is always a germ of truth at the bottom of all legend. In the legend of Abraham there would seem to be no truth whatever. 'These ideas,' he says, 'concerning Abraham, developed as they were stage by stage, do not possess the value of historical data' (i. 95). We must leave the Professor to reconcile these inconsistent statements as best he can. But we must demur altogether to his treatment of his authorities. Those authorities are A, B, C, and D. They have been combined by a redactor. We say nothing whatever now of the probability, which is considerable, that these four authorities have not been correctly distinguished. In spite of the boasted 'agreement of scholars,' the identification rests upon the most uncertain *criteria*. But even supposing the respective contributions to have been correctly ascertained,

we must still call in question the way in which the characteristics of each writer are supposed to be ascertainable. We are constantly told that A's view of this or that portion of the history differs in this or that respect from that of B or C. But what evidence have we that the 'redactor' has given us the whole of A's narrative? And if A, *ex hypothesi*, lived centuries after B or C, must he not have been acquainted with their writings? From what sources, then, distinct from theirs, was *his* narrative derived, is that narrative a pure invention or is it based on historic facts, and why did the 'redactor' combine it with those of B and C instead of rejecting one as inconsistent with the other? If he lived at a time when A's view of the history had been finally adopted, why did he not cast B and C aside altogether? Was the redactor a believer in the necessity of worship at the one sanctuary or not? If he were, why did he not set aside as unsuited to his purpose volumes from which he must have learned that anciently there was no such necessity? If not, why did he not reject the comparatively modern narrative of A, embodying doctrines which the authorities before him plainly showed to be innovations? Among other difficulties which beset the theory of the 'four main streams of tradition,' is the personality of the redactor. Until we are furnished with far more information than we at present possess of his character, aims, and abilities, we must perforce regard his individuality, if indeed there ever were such a person, as the most inscrutable on record. We are frequently bid to regard this or that portion of the history as incredible because of the inconsistencies it presents. But all the inconsistencies and improbabilities of the history as it stands put together do not equal the improbability and inconsistency involved in so strange and puzzling a phenomenon as the redactor himself. Could we obtain some clue to his position, some explanation of the reasons which impelled him to make so singular an attempt at accommodation, the problem of Israelite history, as it is now presented to us, would be materially simplified.

It is true that Professor Schultz tells us that the priestly document has practically been inserted *in extenso*. But even this view must be taken with limitations. The priestly narrative has some very remarkable gaps, which are filled in, according to the critical hypothesis, from the other documents. It is certain, therefore, that we possess only extracts from it. But if any portions have been omitted, we have no information at our command to show what principle of selection guided the redactor in his choice. Instead, therefore, of A's

view of the question, we may be dealing with the character of the redactor's selections from A. In other words, the redactor may have introduced from A some additional particulars which B and C have left out, in the same way as St. Mark and St. Luke, though giving in the main the same narrative as St. Matthew, have occasionally introduced some additional matter of their own. That the whole of A cannot possibly have been inserted will appear from a glance at the portions of Genesis attributed to him. Thus, in the account of Abraham, in spite of the ingenuity with which small portions which form a coherent story have been detached from the rest of the narrative, we have no mention in the priestly document of the way in which Lot went to Sodom.¹ The only mention of this occurs in B or C. But in Gen. xix. 29, we find him, in a portion of the priestly narrative, suddenly represented as dwelling at Sodom.² Now, either A must have contained some mention of this fact which the redactor has omitted, or Lot, according to A, finds himself in Sodom without ever having gone thither. In the same way, in the same verse we find an allusion to the destruction of the cities of the plain as having taken place, but no mention of the way in which it happened.³ The deliverance of Lot also is mentioned in it as owing to Abraham, but the allusion is in no way explained. Then, again, in the after history of the patriarchs, we have no mention of the birth of Jacob or of Esau in the priestly narrative;⁴ we are

¹ There is a curious little passage in Professor Driver's *Introduction* here. In p. 13 he assigns Gen. xiii. 12b to J from 'and moved his tent.' In p. 14 he bases an argument on the occurrence of the words 'cities of the plain' in chapter xiii. 12b and in xix. 29. But on what ground, apart from his theory, does he sever Gen. xiii. b from the narrative of P? There are certainly here no 'stylistic criteria,' nor are there any indications of separate 'sources.' There is not even the use of the words Jehovah or Elohim to guide us. How, then, does Professor Driver prove that his analysis is correct?

² Professor Driver would probably deny that Lot is said to have dwelt in Sodom at all, but only in 'the cities of the plain.' But the priestly writer clearly represents him as having been delivered in some way from the destruction of those cities. And as he is supposed to be writing *after* J and E, he must have been acquainted with their narrative. On what ground, then, does he speak only of the 'cities of the plain,' and not of Sodom, and for what reasons does he avoid all mention of Lot having been at Sodom? These questions, on the theory that the severance of the various documents has been satisfactorily accomplished, will require an answer.

³ Even Professor Driver's skilful analysis does not enable him to escape this difficulty.

⁴ Gen. xxv. 26 is cut in half in the curious way characteristic of the new criticism. So that the first mention of Jacob by the priestly writer is as follows: 'and his [whose?] name was called Jacob, and Isaac was three score years old when she bare *them*' [whom?].

told of Bilhah and Zilpah having been given to Jacob to wife, but there is no mention of their children. Thus it appears morally certain that if the redactor had, as is supposed, a priestly narrative before him, he did not insert it in full, but made such extracts from it as suited him. But in this case it would certainly seem to most men exceedingly strange that these extracts, made to a certain extent at haphazard, should so nearly constitute a brief summary of the events of the lives of the patriarchs. It would suggest a suspicion that an ingenious theorist, with a special object in view,¹ had selected just such plain unadorned statements of fact as would occur in almost any history on such a principle as to constitute the brief matter-of-fact narrative which the theorist aforesaid had found it necessary to invent. The separation has, it must be admitted, been effected with considerable skill. Halves and even quarters of verses have been severed from their connexion in order to avoid any objections which might be made. But why, on this hypothesis, did the redactor diverge from the plain and straightforward narrative he had before him on purpose to insert extracts from a work of an entirely different character? Why did he piece the two accounts together instead of inserting them side by side, as has been done elsewhere? The more this artificial severance of one portion of the narrative from the rest is scrutinized, the more difficult it is to explain the principles on which the narrative was constructed. But this is not the only doubtful theory to which Professor Schultz commits himself. He espouses the exploded theory of solar myths. Readers of Tylor's *Primitive Culture* will remember how this hobby has been ridden to death. Professor Schultz explains Samson's history in this manner. But although the name Samson is kindred with Shemesh (sun), yet the place of the story of Samson in a narrative which, in its main features, is obviously probable enough, as well as the terrible catastrophe in which Samson himself as well as the Philistines are involved, are sufficient to cast considerable doubt on this interpretation of his history, however confidently it may be put forward. It is only fair, however, to admit that the solar myth idea finds considerably more support in the case of Samson than in other parts of the Old Testament narrative which have been so explained.

One portion of the volume we are now considering supplies the refutation of another. Those who are disposed to

¹ Originally that of discovering a *Grundschrift*, be it remembered.

accept the author's view of the post-exilic authorship of Leviticus should first consult the first and second chapters of the second volume, in which the contrast between the pre-exilic and post-exilic religious sentiments of Israel is carefully pointed out. 'It was only in post-exilic times that national pride made Israel take up a really stiff and arrogant attitude towards the "godless" ancient world' (ii. 15). The tendency to substitute devotion to external ordinances for purity of heart after the return from the Captivity is duly noted. As usual with writers of his school, Professor Schultz is unfairly severe on Chronicles. He does not see that allusions to David's great sin, which was perfectly well known, and which therefore there could be no use in attempting to gloss over or to conceal, are simply not made because they did not fall in with the author's plan.¹ When, moreover, we are told that he 'knows nothing' of Sennacherib compelling Hezekiah to pay tribute, Professor Schultz forgets that the author of Chronicles had the Book of Kings before him as he wrote, and transcribed large portions of it *verbatim*. But it is undoubtedly true that the tendency towards Pharisaism begins to manifest itself in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, and becomes more marked as time went on.

'Though the Book of Tobit has, on the whole, a thoroughly moral tendency, it attaches undue importance to almsgiving, prayer, weeping, and fasting, and to going up to the temple in Jerusalem to offer tithes and partake of the joyous sacrificial meal. These things, as well as the horror of eating heathen bread, and the stress laid upon burying fellow-countrymen, show us what a pious man, in the time of the second temple, regarded as the *beau-idéal* of righteousness. The first Book of the Maccabees shows us that the Hasidæans, who seek righteousness and judgment, are specially indignant at any desecration of the temple service or breach of the commandments regarding food, and are zealous for Circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Sabbatical year. . . . But the Book of Judith, in particular, has a tone quite in accordance with Pharisaism proper. In it the high priest, even in Nebuchadnezzar's time, is, along with the elders, the civil head of the people. When the heroine of the book is to be represented as extremely pious, the greatest emphasis is laid on sacrifices and incense offering, on lifelong widowhood, on much fasting—which is interrupted only during the festivals—on lustrations, clean meats, long prayers, and mourning in sackcloth and ashes. It is for the holy vessels which have been consecrated anew that the greatest apprehension is felt. And if there is no lawlessness in

¹ If the post-exilic writers had been dominated by any desire to divert attention from the capital crime of David's life, they certainly would not have composed Psalm li. and ascribed it to him, as we are told they did by the advocates of the post-exilic origin of the Psalms.

Israel—that is, if the people refrain from idolatry and unclean meats—then they are looked upon as invincible, because in that case they are “upright before God” (ii. 44, 45).

Now the more obvious this contrast between pre-exilic and post-exilic tendencies is—and the contrast is borne out by the whole of Professor Schultz's analysis of the teaching of the Old Testament—the more obvious it becomes that the greater part of the Old Testament as we now have it was written before the Exile. The command to keep the three feasts, and the prohibition to mention the name of any other gods, are found in the ‘Book of the Covenant’ (Exod. xx.–xxiii.), which criticism regards as the *earliest* collection of Israelite laws. Thus these regulations, at least, are generally confessed to be of early origin. The ritual instructions for the priests in Leviticus are emphasized by no solemn warnings or threatenings to Israel. The warnings and threatenings and expressions of righteous indignation are reserved for *moral* offences, such as those forbidden in chapters viii.–xx. of that book.¹ Thus the warnings and threatenings have a moral, not a mere ritual, basis. The Book of Leviticus attaches far less importance to mere observances than is attached to them in the Apocrypha, or even in books like those of Ezra and Nehemiah. The violation of the precept concerning mixed marriages is regarded, after the return from the Captivity, in a way markedly different to that in which it is regarded in the Book of Ruth.² The profanation of the holy thing, it is true, calls forth severe reprobation.³ But it is in connexion with the duties of reverence,⁴ of mercy,⁵ of truthfulness,⁶ of justice,⁷ of purity,⁸ and as tending to the idolatrous devil-worship of Pales-tine.⁹ Nor can it be said that the denunciations in chap. xxvi. lay any particular stress on external considerations. It is the breach of the law as a whole, and even, we may fairly contend, the law in its moral, and not in its ritual, aspect, which will bring such terrible consequences as are there predicted upon the people of God. And this consideration is strengthened if we refer to the similar passage in Deut. xxviii. There is absolutely no difference in tone between them. But on the

¹ Lev. xviii. 26–30, xx. 23.

² Compare the treatment of the pious and modest Ruth by Boaz with the passionate indignation evinced by Nehemiah, chap. xiii. 25. Yet no one contends that the Book of Ruth is prior to Exodus xx.–xxiii. The truth is that the *spirit* of the Law was regarded in the pre-exilic, its *letter* in the post-exilic period.

³ Lev. xix. 8.

⁴ Lev. xix. 4, 34.

⁵ Lev. xix. 9.

⁶ Lev. xix. 11, 12.

⁷ Lev. xix. 13–16, 35.

⁸ Lev. xix. 29.

⁹ Lev. xviii. 7.

principles of Professor Schultz and other German critics, such a difference ought to make itself evident, if Leviticus were really the product of an age when the religious system of Israel was beginning to wax old, and when the growing preference of external to moral considerations was the certain index of decay.¹

When Professor Schultz passes from the question of the origin and development of Israelite institutions to the question of Old Testament theology as a whole he is on less debatable ground, and is therefore more useful to the student of the Old Testament. We will not say that his view of the theological teaching under the older Covenant is not occasionally coloured by his critical predilections. In some respects, as we shall see, it is very seriously deteriorated by them. But, on the whole, his presentation of Old Testament teaching is clear and fair. His view of that teaching on forgiveness, for instance, appears sound enough.

‘In the language of living piety, the word *כָּפַר* was chiefly applied to an act of God. He “covers” the sins of his people, that is, He forgives them in virtue of His covenant grace as soon as the heart of the people that has been turned away from Him is again turned towards Him, as soon as ever the people are in circumstances that accord with the Covenant. In that case God never thinks of continuing to punish, of allowing His anger to work itself out. He does that only so long as His people do not return to Him, and have not put away that which God cannot endure in them, since He is the holy guardian of righteousness, who cannot bear with iniquity. In like manner, it is also said of the sinner that he “covers” his guilt, or the punishment of it, when by some means or other he obtains forgiveness. And outside the religious sphere altogether there is the phrase “to cover, with a present, the face” of one who has been insulted—that is, to induce him by means of a present to take no further notice of the insult. In all these cases the word means “to forgive” or “obtain forgiveness,” and has nothing to do with sacrifices’ (i. 397).

And his explanation of the actual process of reconciliation, as described in the prophets, is extremely lucid and satisfactory.

‘The first requisite is earnest and unfeigned sorrow for sin, whether combined with outward tokens of penitence or not. At the preacher’s call to repent, the Israelite must confess that his punishment was just ; must, with penitential tears, acknowledge the chastisement of

¹ Professor Schultz also sees evidences of this decay of Judaism in post-exilic times in the tendency to form sects, in the scepticism manifested in Ecclesiastes, and in the tendency to combine with foreign religious systems (i. 433-38).

God and take words with him, the calves of the lips, instead of outward offerings. He must yearn to be freed, not merely from punishment, which makes him unhappy, but from sin itself, which keeps him at variance with God's holy will. A broken and a contrite heart that loathes its sin finds reconciliation. For "when I would have kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long."

'But when this sorrow is genuine, and no mere "feigned conversion," the whole tenor of the life must give proof of the change. True repentance shows itself in sterling uprightness, generosity, and mercy, and in the forsaking of idolatry. "Break up your fallow ground," cries Jeremiah to his contemporaries. "Make you a new heart and a new spirit," is Ezekiel's advice. And many of the most beautiful passages in the Prophets insist that deeds, not words, prove a conversion true.

'God alone can replace the old antagonism to Himself by this new disposition. He Himself effects conversion by changing the stony heart into a heart of flesh' (ii. 96, 97).

He dwells very strongly on the Jewish doctrine of the *Personality* of God (ii. 103 ff.) There is no difference on this point between any of the authors to whom he ascribes the Pentateuch. God is 'contrasted with the world as self-conscious reason.' He 'reveals Himself as free-will,' that is, 'as wise and moral will.' In the name Jahveh (or Jehovah) is involved the idea of 'unchangeable self-existence, absolute personality.' We could wish, by the way, that that very ambiguous word 'absolute' were either carefully defined or replaced by a better. For it properly means that which is incapable of relation. And we are quite sure that neither does the Bible teach that the Israelite Jehovah is incapable of relation, nor does Professor Schultz intend to represent it as doing so. We may, therefore, be permitted to enter a protest against the word 'absolute' being used as an equivalent to 'essential'—to the *Ding an sich*.

Professor Schultz's remarks on the anthropomorphism of the Old Testament are also well put. We cannot, however, refrain from pointing out how, when off his guard, the Professor instinctively reverts to the traditional view of the Pentateuch as the earliest book of the Old Testament, and admits the gradual development of the idea of God from the time of Moses onward.

'Much more naturally might it be asked whether this idea of God's personality is not so strongly emphasized that His spiritual life, His divinity, is thereby lost. It cannot be denied that in the earlier books of the Old Testament there certainly is an apparent humanisation of God. In fact, it cannot be otherwise. For the human mind

cannot apprehend a personal, conscious, and independent life, save as human. Where it is not the language of the schools that is spoken, but the vivid and sensuous language of daily life, personal life can be described only by expressions borrowed from human life, and by speaking "the language of the children of men." Hence no one who understands the essence of popular speech, and who is not perfectly incapable of appreciating the elevated tone of poetic diction, can possibly take offence at such expressions as God's hand, arm, mouth, eye, or at His speaking, walking, laughing, etc. In such expressions the activity of the living God is simply depicted after the manner of human acts, in the naïve style of popular poetic language. Nor will any reasonable man imagine that such expressions make it impossible for the writers who use them to have a perfect idea of a spiritual God, although, of course, they occur only where a personal and religious relationship to God is in question, not a philosophical knowledge of the Absolute. This style of speech runs quite freely through the whole of the Old Testament. The prophets of the most different ages represent God's acts by metaphors from human life. God appears as a Warrior, as One treading a winepress, as a roaring Lion. He answers out of the whirlwind. He writes, mocks, swears, cries aloud; He calls like a keeper of bees; He musters his army of Medes, raises His banner, brandishes His sword—a sharp and powerful one—and makes bare His holy arm. His voice is the pealing thunder. These metaphors taken just at random, the like of which we can find in all the more imaginative Old Testament writers, show us clearly that what the prophets were most anxious about was to produce, in no doubtful fashion, the conception of a living, personal, acting God. Of course they could not do it in any other way, because their religion had its original foundations, not in a philosophy but in the brightly coloured, naïvely sensuous conceptions of a nature-religion' (ii. 104, 105).

And again :

'Hence to ascribe to God love, hatred, jealousy, fear, wrath, repentance, scorn, etc., is, so far as form is concerned, manifestly inappropriate. But without such epithets a conscious personal life could not be described at all in popular language. If these are taken away, there remains nothing but a cheerless baldness of metaphor which cannot interest a pious heart. . . . These "anthropomorphisms," then, are in no sense a dimming of the perfect idea of God; but they contain, although in popular dress, the really positive part of the statements regarding Him. They become the more prominent, the warmer religion becomes. While post-canonical Judaism, in its emptiness and baldness, shuns them, and the Alexandrian school with its intellect dazzled by the splendour of Hellenic speculation is ashamed to own them, Jesus shows them special favour. The prophets cling with the utmost determination to this style of speech. They preach a jealous God, who does not permit Himself to be mocked with impunity, and a merciful God who is ready to turn from His resolve, who is ready to forgive. They talk frequently

and emphatically of God's anger and zeal, of His love which longs to pardon, of His sorrow for His people's sins, of His joy in human virtue, and of His "repentance." They tell how God laughs, in sublime scorn, at man's pride; and how He consoles Himself and takes vengeance on His enemies. In fact, this freedom of representation goes so far that the poet makes God say that Satan beguiled Him into destroying Job without cause. In the prophetic period, therefore, the full personality of a living God who feels and wills, is insisted on even more strongly than before' (ii. 108, 109).

The tendency to use Elohim in the place of Jehovah in the post-exilic period is mentioned at the close of Part II. chap. vii. The former is, we are told, 'in use during the Levitical period.' If this means the period when Leviticus was written or compiled, this statement cannot be allowed save with important exceptions. Some of the most forcible commands and prohibitions in that book are emphasized by the words, 'I am Jehovah.'¹ In fact, the Book of Leviticus is Jehovistic from beginning to end. This is an additional reason for doubting whether it can possibly have belonged to the period when contact with foreign nations was bringing out the idea of God common to Jew and Gentile, and national misfortune was tending to cast into the shade the idea of Jehovah as the special covenant God of Israel, in obedience to whom Israel was to find prosperity and peace.

'Faith in God,' says our author again, 'as the defender of the right,

'lies at the root of Israel's whole conception of history. From the flood till the conquest of Canaan God shows that He will not permit a breach of morality to pass unpunished: and He applies, through His omnipotence as judge, the standard of His revealed will wherever it is not inwardly realized. Thus He is "the avenger of blood," who does not allow a guilty man to pass unpunished. Hence God's will is indissolubly linked with the great statutes of justice and morality. Because He is Israel's God, that people must not warp and violate justice. In the Ten Commandments He sets up in Israel for all time coming the great landmarks of righteousness towards one's neighbour. Because He is God His conduct must be absolutely upright. Because He is the judge of the world, and therefore the highest source of all justice and all morality, He cannot show respect of persons; He cannot destroy the innocent with the guilty. In His whole treatment of the people He shows Himself blameless in all things, mindful of justice, faithful to His promises and His statutes. With the merciful He is merciful; with the perfect, perfect; with the pure, pure; and with the froward, froward; that is to say, He is the living standard of moral order. He hateth the wicked.

'Now, in the narratives of the Old Testament, there appears to

¹ Notably in chapters xviii-xx.

be a good deal that does not agree with this belief. For example, the partiality shown to covenant friends, even when they are in the wrong, contradicts the true idea of righteousness. But here, on the one hand, it must not be forgotten that God's special love and care of His people forms the foundation-stone of the whole conviction; and, on the other hand, that even Israel will, like the Canaanites, "have to be spued out of the land of Jehovah" if he walk in their ways. In point of fact, according to the idea of ancient justice, the claims of a confederate and the claims of a stranger are quite different. Thus, justice demands that God's promises be fulfilled. Consequently, what appears strange to us was not, in the eyes of the narrators, at any rate, an infringement of justice on the part of God. In like manner it might appear unjust in God to give Israel a land already in the possession of others. But it is always taken for granted that the sin of its inhabitants was already full; that God, as the Lord of the whole earth, can take back what He gave; and that His covenant engagements required Him to give this land to Abraham's seed. Indeed, it is an eternal truth "that a people, rent by internal divisions, and sinking deeper and deeper in moral degradation, must succumb before another people in which there is springing up a vigorous and harmonious life, full of trust in divine power, and therefore striving after higher things" (Ewald) (ii. 153, 154).

What he says as to the Old Testament view of miracles is also extremely valuable and well put:

'The whole Old Testament regards the miraculous as a matter of course. No pious man ever doubts that when God wishes to give His servants special help, by standing by them and punishing His enemies, the necessary occurrences must take place, be they ordinary or extraordinary. Nothing happens without a cause; everything depends upon God, whose word never returns to Him void. By such signs Moses is sustained in his arduous task; according to the later narratives, they are constantly happening to Elijah and Elisha' (ii. 193).

The Old Testament teaching in regard to the origin of sin is, in Professor Schultz's representation of it, strongly coloured by his view of the documents. The Jehovist, according to him, is the only writer in the Old Testament who 'would ever think of explaining it by an historical event—by a fall' (ii. 299). But it is equally certain that none of them would ever think of explaining it in any other way. In fact, as sin must have had an origin, there must have been a first sin; and that first sin was 'an historical event—a fall.' Thus the reason why so little reference is made to the Fall in the Old Testament writings is because it was taken for granted. As Professor Schultz himself remarks, the ascription of Israel's declension to his forgetfulness of God is 'not an explanation of the origin of sin,' it is 'only the description of a fact.'

And it is perfectly certain that the Old Testament as a rule avoids theory, and confines itself to fact. But surely the authors who, as Dr. Schultz admits, explain the universality of human sin by the fleshly nature of man, also teach the transmission of sin from parent to offspring. Job attributes his sin to the fact that the unclean cannot produce the clean, and to his being born of woman.¹ The author of Psalm li. believes himself to have been 'shapen in iniquity' and 'conceived in sin.'² And the writer of Isaiah xliii. 47 seems to have accepted the narrative of the Fall.³

We will conclude with Professor Schultz's view of the Servant of Jehovah, especially as depicted in Isaiah liii. It is 'not without reason,' he tells us (ii. 430), 'that many modern interpreters have conjectured that' this passage 'is not an original part of one prophet's work at all, but a fragment taken by him from an older prophecy. But even supposing this conjecture were right, the fragment must still have been appropriated and altered by the prophet; for, as we now have it, it certainly cannot refer to any historical personage.' Let us contrast Professor Schultz's sketch of the passage with his interpretation of it:

'The suffering Servant of God is perfectly free from guilt. He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth. His suffering was borne voluntarily in patient love. Like a lamb led to the slaughter, He opened not His mouth; He gave His life as a guilt-offering—suffered voluntarily what force was wont to make animal victims suffer in spite of themselves. His suffering is decreed by God to atone for Israel's sins. For the people's sake it pleased God to bruise Him. It was for Israel's weal that he was chastised. By His wounds the people are healed. The guilt of all who are lost in error, God laid upon Him. The blow which ought to have fallen on the people because of their sin, fell on Him. It was Israel's sicknesses and sorrows that He bore. Hence His suffering was not a sign that God was angry with Him. But in order that Israel might be redeemed, in order that God might receive them back again into His love, the Servant of Jehovah took all their suffering upon Himself. Out of divine compassion He, as an atoning Saviour, endured it all in order to secure the salvation of Israel.

'The Servant of Jehovah had to suffer contumely and the death of shame. Like a badly-thriving plant, without form or comeliness, with an appearance betokening superhuman misery, despised by all as one smitten of God and a sinner—what a lot in life was His! And His death was that of a lamb which is led to the slaughter. From prison and from judgment He was hurried off to a violent

¹ Job xiv. 1-4, xv. 14, xxv. 4.

² Ver. 5.

³ Delitzsch interprets this verse as referring to Abraham; but it surely must have been an allusion to Gen. iii.

death. None of His contemporaries bethought themselves that it was solely on behalf of the people that He bore this suffering. As a malefactor He was buried with malefactors.

'Such is the suffering of the Servant of God, and such the true inward cause of this suffering. What Israel suffered among the nations because of its calling unto salvation, what prophetic Israel and its individual members endured because they refused to forsake the people they loved, because they chose disgrace and death that there might remain in Israel a seed of a better future, what meets our eyes in the figure of Job, the suffering friend of God, and what is borne in upon our ears from the Psalms of the persecuted servants of God, is all gathered together here in the ideal figure of the suffering Servant of Jehovah in the epoch of redemption.

'Wonderful for the Sufferer, as for the people, is the result of all this suffering. The sufferer Himself having been miraculously raised from the dead enjoys a long life and is blessed with many descendants. He is, indeed, exalted very high, and makes peoples and kings rise from their places in reverential silence. He divides the spoil with the strong—in other words, He is equal in rank and in power to the great of the earth. Thus, His picture grows into that of a King. And for the world he becomes the instrument by which the work of God is successfully accomplished. By His knowledge of God, He makes many righteous. Consequently, after He has died for the sins of the people and presented His soul as an offering for sin, He lives again for the justification of His people. Thus this wonderful figure combines in itself the figure of the Priest who offers himself up as a sacrifice for the world, the figure of the Prophet who by His knowledge of God brings justification, and the figure of the King who, transfigured and blessed, enjoys the fruit of His sufferings. The glory which Israel expects for itself, the salvation which it hopes to work out for the other nations of the world, the glorification which awaits the true Israel in the last days, and the blissful influences which are to flow from it, are here embodied in an ideal figure. As in the Book of Job, the pious sufferer is at last crowned with glory and, by his intercession, atones for the sins of his hostile friends, so the Servant of Jehovah stands before our gaze, in the age of consummation, delivered from suffering and from death' (ii. 433-435).

And yet this marvellous picture—'absolutely unique,' as Professor Schultz confesses it to be—so marvellously fulfilled, of One who 'His own self bare our sins in His own Body on the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness, by Whose stripes we are healed,' is not, we are informed, to be interpreted of any historical figure. To understand it, one must 'rise above the idea of the people, and particularly of the pious prophetic people, to an ideal picture of the pious Israel of the last days conceived of as a person whose features certainly have been taken from the experience of history'

(ii. 432). No better illustration could be given of the new criticism in its ultimate effects than this. To lame and impotent conclusions like these are we led by those who would refashion history, minimize prophecy, reverse the representation the Scriptures have given us of God's dealings with men. Instead of pointing to Christ by type, by vision, by clear and definite prediction, they point us to nothing, or at least to nothing worth pointing to. Moses did not 'write' of Christ—he did not write at all. The Scriptures of the Old Covenant are not 'they which testify of Him'—they testify to nothing except to an 'ideal picture' which in no way corresponds to the thing represented. For how is the 'pious Israel of the last days'—whatever that may mean—represented in the various concurring portraiture of the Servant of Jehovah, which find their realization in Christ and in Him alone? Professor Robertson has complained that 'instead of hearing in the prophetic voices the echo thrown backward over the centuries of the Gospel of Christ,' we get from the modern theories 'some dry analysis of the "idea" and the "conception" of each prophet . . . but we catch no fire from the prophetic words as they are weighed and measured out in the scales of the critics.'¹ We ask for some *rationale* of the motives which induced the Jewish and the Christian Church to hand down the Scriptures of the Old Covenant with such deep reverence, and the critics are as mute as when we ask them to tell us what were the 'germs' of religious truth and moral law transmitted by Abraham, published authoritatively by Moses, and developed by the prophets. 'By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?'² Even so is it with men who reduce the Divine plan for the education of the world to a *congeries* of myths, and the voice of the Spirit of Christ which 'did signify' to the prophets 'the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow,'³ to vague and unintelligible forecasts of something which can never be proved to have happened.

'Our little systems have their day ;
They have their day and cease to be.'⁴

And when their short reign is over, men will begin again to 'ask for the old paths, where is the good way' wherein our forefathers under the Old and New Covenant alike have 'walked' in the interpretation of Scripture, and wearied with the inconsistency and ever shifting mutability of modern

¹ *Early Religion of Israel*, pp. 475, 476.

² Matt. vii. 16.

³ 1 Pet. i. 11.

⁴ Tennyson.

exegesis, will return to the unchanged and unchanging traditions of the Churches, Jewish and Christian alike, and in them will 'find rest unto their souls.'¹

ART. III.—BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX.

Bernard of Clairvaux: The Times, the Man, and his Work.

By RICHARD S. STORRS, D.D., LL.D., Author of *The Divine Origin of Christianity*, &c. (London, 1892.)

WE are pleased to give a very hearty welcome to Dr. Storrs' most interesting monograph upon the life and times of St. Bernard. The series of Lectures of which his volume is composed do not, indeed, contain a complete biography, still less do they set before us an exhaustive account, of the Abbot of Clairvaux as a great spiritual teacher; but they do present a striking and singularly lucid portrait of one of the most picturesque of ecclesiastical heroes. Dr. Storrs brings to his task considerable stores of learning, a genuine sympathy with all that is noblest in ages of Church history whose conditions were widely different from our own, a penetrating comprehension of salient and essential points and the power of placing them vividly before his readers, and a rapid yet firm grasp of the core and crown of things upon which he concentrates attention, and so keeps the interest of his narrative unflagging. Add to these advantages a swift, flowing style and such command of eloquence as seems to be the universal and congenital gift of our Transatlantic cousins, and we have most of the elements for so brilliant a work as that now before us. As is commonly the case, Dr. Storrs' forte occasionally becomes his foible. His pages are at times overlaid with *sesquipedalia verba*, and some usages, which we presume to be Americanisms, jar upon our English taste. The introduction of abstract terms in the plural, the coinage of somewhat turgid adjectives—such as unsubduable, shattering, accusable, laical, inerrant, and undivine—or of such awkward verbals as 'affixed' for 'related to' and 'antagonized' for 'in conflict with,' have not yet, we believe, become authorized in England. Nor do we as yet recognize 'uplift' as a synonym of 'exaltation' or 'cosmical' of 'world-wide,' or employ grandiose epithets, such as 'ebullient' and 'supernal,' in simple and sober narrative so unreservedly as poetic terms

¹ Jer. vi. 16.

of this kind are scattered upon Dr. Storrs' pages. Probably, however, some readers will complain more strongly against the colloquialisms which at times break very strangely the regular march of the historical narration. This last blot is no doubt owing to the fact that the contents of the book were originally delivered as lectures; but the labour of their excision would have been but trifling, and it would have spared us the irritation caused by these parentheses—an irritation often heightened by the obvious affectation and unreality of such ejaculations as 'you all know' or 'you are of course aware,' employed to introduce some statement of which nine-tenths of the audience would infallibly be ignorant. Such minor blemishes are, however, of small moment, and do not seriously detract from a singularly fascinating book, with which we are confident our readers will be as delighted as we have been ourselves.

It is one of the many changes wrought through the general acceptance of the doctrine of development that we approach the study of history or biography, as well as that of any branch of physical science, with very different preconceptions from those which prevailed before the days of Herbert Spencer and Charles Darwin. Even in the instance of so unique a character as St. Bernard we are confident that an explanation of his genesis will be found in the special conditions of his age. Dr. Storrs is therefore justified, alike from a scientific and an artistic point of view, in throwing his portrait into the strongest relief by setting it in the dark and lurid background of the tenth century. A brighter era was beginning to dawn upon Christendom—the date of his birth was 1091—when St. Bernard was ushered into the world. Paradoxical as the statement may appear, the deep corruption of the times had its influence, amongst other conditions, in the evolution of the last and one of the most saintly of the fathers. The utter degradation of the age admitted of no compromise on the part of those who would be champions of Christianity. As no meaner type of ascetic devotedness than that of Elijah, with his superb contempt of all things earthly, could recover Israel under the luxurious and sensual rule of Ahab; so the absolute self-surrender of St. Bernard was essential to the performance of the hardly less miraculous and seemingly impossible task which lay before him.

Let us regard St. Bernard for a moment as the product of his age. It was the birth-time of chivalry, and therein, we think, lies the secret of a personality so enthralling. The whole

tone and temper of St. Bernard were moulded by that spirit of chivalry whose very extravagance is winning. There is such utter *abandon* in it, such forgetfulness of self, such entire whole-heartedness, such absolute faith in the supreme excellence of its ideal. It stands out in such singular contrast with the chilling distrust of our own day, which asks with an air of conscious superiority to the Divine order of the world whether life is worth living. It was the birth-time of chivalry, and all the circumstances of St. Bernard's environment were calculated to evolve a lofty type of that fascinating ideal. The deference and dignity of noble birth, the sweetness engendered by gentle maternal training, the unreserved consecration of all mortal powers to knightly duty, the romantic pursuit, without regard to insuperable difficulties, of a lofty, perhaps an unattainable, aim, the absolute surrender of self to every behest of an accepted liege, the unqualified courage which never blenched in face of danger—all these high qualities were, in the case of St. Bernard, transfigured and transmuted by the consciousness of an inward divine vocation. He lived as seeing Him who is invisible, and he acted in the loftiest spirit of his time. As Bayard *sans peur et sans reproche* was its ideal warrior, and Dante was *par excellence* its poet, so St. Bernard stands out pre-eminently and essentially as the prophet of chivalry. It may be interesting to inquire how far the facts of St. Bernard's life and work correspond to our theory.

St. Bernard's childhood and early training were well calculated to prepare him for his after career. 'Heaven lay about him in his infancy.' The beauty of his ancestral home in the Côte d'Or; the order which reigned through the castle of Fontaines—a name ever memorable to us through its reproduction in the magnificent abbey whose ruins glorify the narrow valley of the Skell; the spotless honour, the courtly gentleness, the dauntless courage of his father Tescelin; the saintly, consecrated life of his mother Aletta—herself a scion of the reigning house of Burgundy; all these exercised so lasting an influence upon St. Bernard that we may well believe that he never lost 'the glory and the freshness' of his early days. In after years Nature was ever to him 'apparelled in celestial light,' and he avowed that what he learned of Holy Scripture and its spiritual meaning was mostly vouchsafed him when engaged in prayer and meditation in field or forest with no teacher save the oaks and beeches, whom he would speak of with a smile as his masters and his friends. Dr. Storrs rightly notes it as well worthy of remark

that this, 'the busiest man of his time, and while society and life incessantly challenged his immediate attention, not with picturesque pageants, but with great religious and secular movements, on which he was prompt to impress his force, kept always his relish for the country' (p. 157). Nature and the Bible were to him the two main sources of light and leading. '*Experto crede*,' he writes to Henry Murdach, afterwards Archbishop of York, in one of those burning, searching letters of his which must have been sharper than any two-edged sword to their recipients, with their fervid personal appeals, which sound so startling to modern ears, 'What wonder if you fluctuate between prosperity and adversity, you who have not yet planted your feet upon the rock? I have heard thou readest the prophets, thinkest thou thou understandest what thou readest? Thou wilt apprehend Christ rather by imitation than by reading.' Amidst such exhortations, rendered yet more caustic in the terse Latin of the times, St. Bernard's testimony to the influence of external nature is the more forcible. '*Experto crede*. Thou wilt find something fuller in the forests than in books. Trees and rocks will teach you what you can never learn from human masters. Thinkest thou not that honey can well out to thee from the rock and oil from the flinty rock? Do not the mountains drop sweetness and the hills flow with milk and honey?'¹

A yet deeper impression was wrought by the teaching and example of his mother. Aletta was one of those saintly women who contrived to graft all the virtues of monastic life upon the conscientious performance of domestic duty. Each of her seven children—Bernard was the third—was consciously borne by her for God, and dedicated to His service. Each in turn, as well as their noble father, was eventually drawn by Bernard's irresistible attraction within the convent's walls. Before the birth of her most illustrious son Aletta was taught in a dream that he would be a signal champion of the faith, and exceptional care was bestowed upon his early training. Her own example enforced the lofty aspirations she strove to kindle in the boy's heart. Alone, and on foot, she was often seen on the road between Fontaines and Dijon, bearing food to the poor, medicine to the sick, spiritual consolation to the troubled. Her home hours were divided between prayer and fasting and the instruction of her children. Her reverence for the clergy was specially remarkable. On the annual festival of St. Ambrose, the patron saint of Fontaines, all the priests of the district

¹ Ep. cvi.

were feasted at the castle, and it was on this day, when they were thus assembled and were singing the Litany around her bed, that her spirit all too early (as men deemed it) passed away.

Bernard was still young when his mother died. Of fiery temper, high-spirited, and handsome, he was well fitted to shine in court and camp alike. Fresh from the school of Châtillon, pressed by the entreaties of the young nobility, fired by the example of his father and elder brothers, the youth chose a soldier's career. It was not long before repentance seized him. The higher honour of intellectual pursuits, which he had followed eagerly at Châtillon; the stimulus of no ignoble ambition which would have opened out to him the foremost ecclesiastical dignities; it was not such thoughts as these which moved him. The image of his dead mother haunted his spirit, at one time adjuring him with loving reproaches, at another with earnest supplications, to forsake the world and enter the cloister. At length, on a journey to join his brothers, then engaged in besieging the castle of Granci, the assurance of his vocation came upon him with a force that was irresistible. He retired to a road-side church hard by, and then and there devoted himself to a religious life.

From that moment his self-renunciation was absolute: his conviction that the life of perfection was unattainable outside the cloister utter and complete. No earthly tie was too sacred to be torn asunder, no secular duty too imperative to outweigh the call to it. Husbands must separate from their wives, parents be bereft of their children, soldiers lay down their arms. Home, wealth, honour, earthly affection—all were but as dust in the balance. What should it profit if one should gain the whole world and lose his own soul? The neophyte's ardour was not satisfied with his self-dedication in his twenty-third year to the monastic life; he eagerly pressed his associates to join him. A goodly band of the young nobility, many of them in early married life, were carried away by his impetuosity. Of his grown-up brothers, all save Gerard, the second, prepared to take the vows. An interval of six months tested the reality and permanence of their profession, and gave opportunity to arrange their secular affairs. At its close the men adopted the severe discipline of the Cistercians at Cîteaux, the women entered the newly-founded convent of Juilly, of which the wife of Guido, Bernard's eldest brother, was the first abbess. As the brothers left Fontaines, Guido turned to Nivard, the youngest, a child still at play, and said, 'See, the whole inheritance

will now devolve on you.' 'What!' said the boy, 'you take heaven for yourselves and leave me only earth? That is no fair division.' In after years Nivard joined his brothers, and Tescelin, overwhelmed with grief at the loss of his sons, retired to Clairvaux and died there in Bernard's arms.

For the present, however, the circle of converts was incomplete, since his dearly loved Gerard was not yet won over. The young knight resisted all the entreaties of Bernard, who left him with words of anxious but confident warning: 'I know, my brother, nothing but suffering will bring you to reflection, but it shall come to pass, and quickly, too, that a lance shall pierce thy side and so open thy heart to the counsel of salvation, which thou dost now despise.' A subsequent lance-wound and the imprisonment of Gerard fulfilled the prophecy and wrought the desired repentance. 'Your wound is not unto death but unto life,' was the message he sent to the prison, from which Gerard shortly afterwards escaped to rejoin Bernard at Citeaux.

The record of St. Bernard's monastic life presents the most chivalric ideal of self-mortification. The flesh was to be utterly subdued to the spirit. The teacher of his brethren must in his own body fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ. No measure of personal suffering was too great, no discomfort too intolerable for one over whom the ordinary passions and appetites of the flesh seemed no longer to have any power. Nor was it only for the sake of others that he endured hardness and practised abstinence to a degree that sounds incredible to our self-indulgent age. From its tabernacle, thus refined of its grosser humours, his spirit soared aloft in ecstatic contemplation, and for hours together his very senses lay dormant whilst the inner consciousness was ravished with a deeper sense of the love of God. At such times outward things failed to attract him. Even his love for natural scenery seemed spellbound. He rode all day on one occasion along the shore of the Lake of Geneva, and did not know till evening that the lake had been near him. Did the visions thus vouchsafed enable him to carry into the crises of his outer life that indomitable spirit and that consciousness of God's power and presence which brought him in triumph through difficulties and dangers which to others would have been insurmountable?

At what cost of bodily health his severities were enforced is clearly described by Dr. Storrs as follows:

'He was really a wretched invalid during all his public life, not having health enough in a year to suffice an ordinary man for a

week. Such had been his early austerities that he had almost wholly lost the power of distinguishing flavours ; drinking oil, when it stood near him, in place of water or wine, without knowing the difference ; requiring a sort of pious fraud on the part of those ministering to him to make him take what was suitable. His usual food was a bit of bread moistened with warm water, with very little to drink. The very thought of food was commonly repulsive to him, and what he took seemed only to postpone death, not effectively to nourish life. At one time he had to be wholly retired from the monastery for a year, and constrained, almost by violence on the part of his friends, to live by himself, in a rude hut, under the charge of a rustic empiric whom Bernard regarded as an "irrational beast," but who really seems to have done him some good. He did not then recognize any difference in taste between butter and raw blood, and relished nothing except the water which cooled his throat. Yet William of St. Thierry, who visited him there, says that he found him in this mean hut, such as were built for leprous persons along highways, exulting as in the joys of Paradise. . . . Yet in his solitude, the writer adds, he was not alone, since God was with him, and the guardianship and comfort of holy angels. William found no difficulty in believing that alternate choirs of heavenly voices were there to be heard ; for in the light which proceeded from the hut he seemed to himself to see new heavens and a new earth, the Golden Age returning at Clairvaux' (pp. 193-4).

It is no wonder that similar convictions possessed the soul of one who lived ever on the borderland of the unseen world, of which the veil (as he believed) was at times uplifted for him. As a child, one Christmas Eve he had fallen asleep in church, and had dreamed that the infant Saviour appeared to him. When entreating Gerard to adopt the monastic life, the vision of their mother Aletta had appeared to both the brothers. At great crises of sickness or anxiety like revelations nerved his heart to cope with and to conquer the impossibilities imposed upon him. The assurance of peace to the distracted Church, divided in its allegiance between rival popes, came to him as he journeyed, fearful and trembling, to the Council of Etampes through the vision of a rich church filled with the harmonious praises of a throng of worshippers. As he lay racked with fever the gentle touch of the Virgin Mother checked the fierce flow of saliva from his lips, or, according to the legend of after years, assuaged it from the breast on which the Infant Redeemer had hung. That he could and did perform miracles, both himself and his contemporaries unhesitatingly believed ; and his secretary, Godfrey, himself in after years abbot of Clairvaux, affirmed that by his presence, his word, his touch, the blind were made to see, the deaf to hear, and the paralyzed to walk.

Shall we suppose that all these were but the vain hallucinations of a man of whom it was truly written that 'the humility of his heart surpassed the sublimity of his fame?' Shall we affirm, with the complacent confidence of a materialistic age, that the Master who stood by and strengthened St. Paul in the second century never vouchsafed like consolation a thousand years later to St. Bernard in the form best suited to the convictions of his day? Shall we disregard the persistent testimony that no exaltation was ever engendered in him by the profuse adulation of princes or people from without, or by the abundance of the revelations from within? Or shall we conclude with Neander that such marvels, 'when they appear in connexion with a governing Christian temper, actuated by the spirit of love, may perhaps be properly regarded as solitary workings of that higher power of life which Christ introduced into human nature?' (p. 199). For himself, St. Bernard claimed no authority derived from these powers, which perplexed rather than elated him. One special subject indeed was (in his own words) 'often on his lips, ever in his heart—this is always his highest philosophy, to know Jesus Christ and Him crucified.'¹

The result of his constant meditation on this theme is thus admirably described by Dr. Storrs:

'There was nothing morbid, and nothing debilitating to the spirit of Bernard in this frequent meditation on the sufferings of the Lord. On the other hand, it was simply exalting and quickening to whatever in him was most heroic. The thought of the Cross illuminated the Gospel and glorified the Church; and it carried him on, with unflinching inspiration, to and through all magnificent enterprise. Because the Lord had been divinely compassionate, he sought and strove to reproduce in himself this heavenly temper. Because the King of Grace and Glory had dared and suffered all things for him, he feared no peril, and shrank from no pain, in His supreme service. In general, it may certainly be said of his character that it was marked, quite beyond parallel in his time, by the combination in it of the affectionate and meditative habit, which if left to itself might have made him an absorbed musing mystic, with the intensely practical spirit, which if left to itself would have made his life effective no doubt, but mechanical, diplomatic. The union of the two gave him his pre-eminence; and they were as subtly interfused in his soul as are heat and light in the solar beam' (pp. 184-5).

Little more than a year had passed since Bernard and his companions had been enrolled at Cîteaux, and the monastery, which had meanwhile sent forth two swarms to form fresh

¹ Serm. on Cant. xliii.

abbeys, again became too narrow for its occupants. Twelve monks were selected to found a new colony, and Bernard, at the age of twenty-four, was appointed as their leader. Amid the lamentations of the brethren whom they left behind, the little band set out upon their long and weary journey, Bernard carrying the cross at their head, and leading the chants—their Psalm of Degrees—as they started on their pilgrimage. It was in the month of June, and in the year of grace 1115. Nearly a hundred miles away a wild and dreary valley, called in early days the Valley of Wormwood, had been granted by the piety of Hugh of Champagne to the Abbey of Cîteaux for a religious house, and thither the pilgrims bent their steps. In after years the chroniclers grew eloquent over the charms of Clara Vallis; but the scene of desolation when Bernard and his company reached it was one which might have made the stoutest heart to quail. The rudest accommodation had to be provided by their own labour. The season was too late for a full harvest, and starvation more than once was imminent. The faith and courage of their leader were sorely taxed, and relief only came after long and earnest prayer. 'In great distress of spirit at the ruin which appeared to threaten his new abbey, while pouring out his soul in prayer, Bernard saw the hills round about him full of men, various in dress and condition, descending toward the valley, till the valley could not contain them' (p. 189). Unceasing labour overcame all difficulties, and the hardships of life were sweetened by spiritual joys, until at length the wilderness and the solitary place were glad for them, and the desert rejoiced and blossomed as the rose.

For, despite the hardships inevitable in their new settlement and the severe discipline of their order, life at Clairvaux was full of charm to its inmates. Occasionally the heart of a weak brother would go back to the fleshpots of Egypt, or would seek refuge by flight to some more luxurious convent, or would neglect the menial duties which all performed in turn. But such rare instances were soon recalled to penitence at the abbot's unsparing, but most tender and touching remonstrances. So strong a fascination bound them to Clairvaux that it was with difficulty any of the monks would leave it, even to rule over houses in more fertile valleys and under more genial skies. Hundreds of aspirants applied for admission, and those who were sent forth at Bernard's command to posts of honour complained of their exile from their home. Even to the highest earthly dignity—the triple

crown of the Pontificate—Eugenius III. went with tears from the beautiful valley. No wonder if the heart of its founder ever turned to it with unquenchable affection. To him it was ever the beloved Jerusalem, the gates of Zion, loved of the Lord more than all the dwellings of Jacob.

His own life there was one of unwearied labour, and strikingly illustrates his chivalric devotion to the welfare of those committed to his charge. When at Clairvaux he preached every day, and loving hands took notes of the sermons, of which more than three hundred have come down to us. Fresh from long and ardent meditation upon the sufferings of our Blessed Lord, saturated with study of Holy Scripture, which he esteemed above all secular learning, burning with zeal for the spiritual growth of souls personally dear to him, Bernard poured out of a full heart exhortation and doctrine, counsel and entreaty. Love and suffering were his favourite themes, and the Song of Solomon supplied the subject for nearly a hundred of his sermons. Verily, as he himself confessed, his tongue was the pen of a ready writer. An inexpressible tenderness, an irresistible magnetism, carried away his hearers, who could never forget that the preacher whose voice swayed all Christendom, and who for their sakes had refused its highest honours, taught yet more eloquently by example than by precept, and that the hands which had for them put aside the pallium of Rheims and the mitre of St. Ambrose were content to take their turn in washing the plates or greasing the boots of the community. More than all, the great loving heart of the man, unsubdued by all his monastic self-repression, burst forth now and again with uncontrollable emotion, as on the death of his brother Gerard. The sermon in which he gave vent to his lamentations is too long for insertion here, and fragmentary quotations convey no adequate conception of it. It is an undying example of the most passionate attachment, at once chastened and comforted by the deepest submission to the Divine Will and by unshaken assurance of the glory yet to be revealed.

The austerities encouraged at Clairvaux were by no means universally practised in the richer monasteries, and Bernard's writings abound in remonstrances, not only against the luxury which disgraced some of the wealthier convents, but also against the false notion, then as ever widely prevalent, that any outward observance, however rigid, could possess inherent merit. That the inner man must be renewed by the spirit of love; that the kingdom of God is within us; that the reason must be enlightened, the will disciplined, and the

heart purged from sin through divine grace ; that the purpose and the effect of severe Christian training is that the will should be beguiled by loving suasion to love and long after heavenly things, and the soul so satisfied with their marrow and fatness that it should disregard earthly vanities ; these topics, in every variety of insistence and illustration, form the staple of his addresses, whether he is urging the essential duties of pontiff or prelate, of priest or abbot—whether he recalls a stray member of his own flock to the bitter sweets of ascetic life at Clairvaux or depicts in terms of unsparing fidelity the scandals which abound within the cloistered walls of Clugny. Never did spiritual guide lay on the lash more unrelentingly, and no rank, even the most exalted, availed to turn aside the keen, biting edge of the knife which dissected and lay bare all the workings of human self-deception and excuse. A few very brief extracts from the *Apologia* to the Abbot William may at once illustrate some features of monastic temptation, and Bernard's method of handling them :

'How is it,' he writes, 'that we see such excess in eating and drinking amongst monks, such luxury in dress, in bed-coverings, in horse-trappings, in erection of buildings ; and the greater the excess the more flourishing the cause of religion is esteemed to be ? For lo ! economy is now held to be avarice, and sobriety ill-breeding, and silence melancholy ; and, on the contrary, laxity is called discretion, and profusion liberality, and loquacity politeness, and laughter pleasantness' (cap. viii.).

No *mauvaise honte* restrained him from entering into minutest details of the banquets and the dress of those who were supposed to have renounced the world and to be leading a life of perfect self-sacrifice :

'Formerly, visits were exchanged for the purpose of mutual edification and to break the bread of the soul. Now this celestial food is neither desired nor received.'

But in its place dish succeeds dish—large fishes in double rows, served with divers seasoning, and filling five or six courses—eggs dressed in variety past enumerating, turned and metamorphosed and beaten and hardened and minced and fried and roasted and fricassed and stuffed. And then the wine—the apostle's advice to Timothy is not forgotten, save that part of it which limits it *to a little* !—and on feast days there must be foreign wines and liqueurs, and even these sprinkled with powders to give them a more dainty flavour. What a world of scorn and pity is poured forth upon the monastic dandy in search of a cowl to suit his taste !

'When you want to buy a cowl, you look all through the cities, go round the markets, run through the shops, search the houses of traders, turn over the entire stock of each of them, unroll vast bales of cloth, handle them with your fingers, lift them close to your eyes, hold them up in the sun's rays. Whatever is coarse, whatever is faded, you reject; but if any please you through its purity or brilliancy, that you directly are eager to retain at any cost whatever.'¹

Yet even here he is not content with upbraiding the luxury of Clugny, without rebuking at the same time the Pharisaic spirit in which the Cistercians prided themselves upon their own stricter *régime*:

'It is not the cowl which indicates the true monk, but piety and lowliness of mind, which are the raiment of the spirit; humility in sables is better than arrogance in sackcloth. What avails it us that our life is austere, our dress simple, our labour wearisome and painful, our watchings and fastings continual, if we indulge a Pharisaic folly in despising others? If we do our works to be seen of men and have in this life only hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. Surely we might have found a pleasanter way to hell. Woe, woe to the poor who are proud! Woe, I say once, and woe again to those who carry the cross of Christ, but do not follow Christ, who are indeed partakers of His sufferings, but neglect to copy His humility!'²

We have not space to discuss here the questions at issue between Clugny and Clairvaux. It must suffice to say that both their abbots were animated by a spirit of genuine charity, and that through mutual concessions peace was established between the two communities.

For the present the severer discipline of Clairvaux attracted postulants from every quarter of Latin Christendom. Soon the rude buildings of its earliest settlement became too narrow for the brethren which crowded to their shelter, and with sore misgivings Bernard consented that larger premises should replace the original structure. Ere long five hundred monks were enrolled as inmates, and daughter communities sprang up on either side of the Alps and across distant seas. France, Spain, Holland, England, Ireland, Savoy, Germany, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden were all the seats of some of the hundred and sixty monasteries which before Bernard's death had emanated from Clairvaux. Princes and prelates, states and municipalities, held it an honour to secure an offshoot from the house and from under the training of the foremost spiritual leader of the age. Vast as was the labour thus occasioned, a labour to which Bernard would gladly

¹ *Apol.* cap. x. 926.

² *Ibid.* cap. i. § 2.

have devoted all his powers, his age had other work for him to do of yet wider importance and on a more exalted platform. All Western Europe, all that was most influential and progressive in the Latin Church, instinctively turned to Bernard in the great crises which arose in his day, and whose issues were of far-reaching import to Western civilization, and to the authority of the Roman pontiff. Three crucial problems of the utmost gravity—the papal schism, the heresies of Abelard, and the Second Crusade—all found their solution in the direction in which the irresistible momentum of his influence was exerted.

We are not surprised at the energy with which Bernard laboured to heal the schism and the scandal of two rival claimants to the unique primacy of Christendom. He was born at an epoch when a line of pontiffs in legitimate succession to the principles and policy of Hildebrand was upholding the authority of the Papacy against overwhelming opposition, and was successfully vindicating the most extravagant pretensions to a power that was practically boundless. Not only were all spiritual persons, but all secular princes too, the Emperor himself not excepted, subject, according to Hildebrand's haughty assertion, to the final and unimpeachable decision of the patriarch of Rome. In the most unqualified terms all authority was arrogated to St. Peter's chair. 'When the Lord said to Peter, Feed my sheep, He made no exception in favour of Kings.' 'Christ substituted His own sovereignty in the place of that of the Cæsars, and the Roman pontiffs rule over more kingdoms than the Emperors ever possessed.' He claimed the right to release subjects from obedience to their princes, to exempt abbots from the jurisdiction of their bishops, and bishops from the authority of their metropolitans. If we have lordship in spiritual things, how much more in worldly things! was his reply to the remonstrance that he was overstepping the bounds of his legitimate sovereignty. And, in his own judgment, his dominion was as minute as it was extensive. 'From the place which I occupy,' he wrote to the people of Lombardy, 'I must, whether I will or no, proclaim justice and truth to all nations and obey the Lord who has said, "Cry aloud without ceasing, spare not and tell men all their iniquities: if you leave but one sinner in his wickedness, it is from thee I will require an account for his soul."' Did ever mortal lips before dare utter his haughty vaunt, 'By me kings reign and princes decree judgment'? Does not the modern Ultramontane doctrine that all episcopacy is centred in the Papacy find its exact parallel in the claim of the twelfth century that all

spirituality has there, too, its centre—the spirituality that judgeth all things, but itself is judged of no man ?

Outrageous as these pretensions sound to ourselves, there were many circumstances which recommended their acceptance when they first were promulgated. Amidst the universal oppression and corruption of the times men were ready to welcome whatever promised an amelioration without too rigid a scrutiny into the legitimacy of its claims. From the commencement of the conflict between Hildebrand and Henry IV. the party of the former was identified with the reformation of the clergy, with the suppression of simony and concubinage, with the rightful independence of the spiritual power, with the restraint of the intolerable licence of the feudal sovereigns and their nobles. On the one hand, the extravagance of the papal claims was qualified by the admission of Hildebrand and his successors, that their power was committed to them to be exercised in defence of justice and truth. On the other hand, the conscience of Christendom was gladdened by the boldness with which the adulteries of powerful monarchs were rebuked, by the discipline to which even a French king or a German emperor was made submissive, by the furtherance of peace through the extension of the Truce of God, and by the diversion of Christian nations from internecine slaughter to a common enterprise against the enemies of the Christian faith in the First Crusade. When we remember further that the pretensions of Hildebrand and his successors were put forward in unquestionable sincerity, that they were undauntedly maintained under the most discouraging conditions, that they were hallowed by the sufferings of their upholders as well as promoted by their unwearied activity, it is little wonder that they gathered strength even after so powerful an advocate as Gregory VII. had passed away. By the time that Bernard was called upon to intervene in the question, the foremost theologians of France had espoused the policy of Hildebrand so vehemently as to regard it almost as an article of faith, and the famous Yves of Chartres could write to his own metropolitan, ‘You ought to know full well that whoever questions the decisions of the Apostolic See incurs, by that very act, suspicion of heretical pravity.’ His letter was written in the last decade of the eleventh century. Before another forty years had passed, Europe witnessed the strange spectacle of a German Emperor (Lothaire) asking the Pope to ratify his election ; the successors of Charlemagne had hitherto been wont to claim the right of confirming all elections to the Papal chair.

It was a monstrous scandal that two Christian bishops—the foremost in the whole Church Catholic—should each of them arrogate to himself the unique and exclusive power we have been describing, and that each should smite his adversary and all his following with terrific anathemas of infinite efficiency. Men might well ask in blank amazement, Is Christ divided? when in every diocese the partisans of either side devoted their opponents to eternal perdition. A dark shadow of uncertainty obscured the confidence of priestly efficacy in sacrament or service, lest perchance the minister should have been erroneously selected between incompatible antagonists. The dispute, envenomed with all the rancour of religious hate, was apparently interminable, for lack of any superior tribunal for its ultimate decision, except by an appeal to arms. Was the ecclesiastical unity which alone then held Europe together to be broken, and were its Christian kingdoms to be deluged with blood in order to determine to which of the rival claimants the sovereignty of the Kingdom of God rightly belonged?

Yet the solution of the question involving such grave issues was terribly complicated. A larger number of votes had been cast for Anacletus than for Innocent, and the wealth of the former secured him overpowering influence in Italy, besides numerous adherents in France and Germany. The election of Innocent, again, was avowedly lacking in certain formalities, upon which his opponents unceasingly insisted. In so anxious an emergency Louis VI. summoned a council of notables at Etampes, and by unanimous consent the decision was remitted to Bernard. Is it too much to say that his position was unparalleled? He had obeyed the royal summons with the deepest anxiety, which was relieved by the vision to which we have already referred, and he proceeded with confidence to scrutinise the rival claims. Upon the personal character of Innocent and his supporters the final determination in his favour was principally grounded, and when announced it was accepted with enthusiastic unanimity. The King of France and his great feudatory nobles, with a vast concourse of archbishops and bishops and mitred abbots, bowed before his judgment as though God the Holy Ghost had manifestly prompted it. 'No higher testimony,' writes Dr. Storrs, 'could have been given to the influence and to the prestige which had come to belong to this unobtrusive individual abbot, thirty-nine years of age, and wearing none of the dazzling titles in Church and State' (p. 530). Important as was the declaration of France in favour of Innocent, immense exer-

tions were necessary to win over the rest of Europe to his side. The German Emperor Lothaire hesitated, and raised the awkward question of investiture as the price of his support. The English bishops so largely inclined to Anacletus as to justify Henry's unwillingness to declare himself for his rival. 'Answer to God for your other sins,' was Bernard's impetuous reply ; 'let the blame of this one rest wholly on me.' Three years were spent in ceaseless journeys and unremitting efforts to restore the unity of Christendom. Germany, France, England, and Spain were won over, but the Italian States still held aloof, and three times the indefatigable abbot crossed the Alps, travelling in turn to Pisa, Genoa, Milan, and his presence, his eloquence, his irresistible *elan* carried all before him. Crowds gathered round his lodging, bishops waited humbly at his door, the Pope himself took private counsel from his lips. Cities once most hostile to him clamoured to retain him. Genoa offered him her vacant archbishopric. Milan would take no denial to her urgency that he should fill the throne of St. Ambrose, and he only escaped its importunities by stratagem. Miracles marked his progress, virtue went out from his very touch. Complete success finally crowned his labours, and with the resignation of Victor—who had been chosen on the death of Anacletus—of the Papal insignia into the hands of Bernard, the seven years' schism was closed. Never was triumph more meekly borne. In the midst of the struggle, when Bernard's fame was at its height, he had conducted the Pope on a visit to Clairvaux, and his Holiness, with his splendid train of prelates and courtiers, was moved to tears as they witnessed the affectionate welcome with which the tattered band of monks, bearing a cross of stone, greeted their abbot. Within five days after the end of the struggle, whilst Rome was still in a tumult of rejoicing, Bernard had resumed his life of peaceful lowliness in his beloved Clairvaux.

The controversy with Abélard presents the abbot of Clairvaux in his least attractive light to modern readers. The transcendent abilities, the ungovernable passions, the terrible punishment, the vast popularity and the mournful downfall of the knight-errant of philosophy have encircled him with a halo of romantic pathos which the lapse of seven centuries has hardly dimmed, and which rightly enlists our sympathies in his conflict with his powerful opponent. In estimating the motives at work on either side, there is no necessity to impute to Bernard personal jealousy or any dread lest his fame should be eclipsed. The antagonism between them lay far

deeper down. It was essentially innate to their mind and spirit. The two men represented the two opposite poles of human thought and tendency. Bernard looked at everything from the side of law, Abélard from that of freedom. Bernard held the obedience which submits in all humility to Church-teaching to be the first duty of a Christian man; Abélard deemed that the boldest exercise of man's intellect, even upon the deepest mysteries of Christianity, was the very purpose for which that God-given intellect had been bestowed. From the very bottom of his soul Bernard believed that the most essential of all forms of self-denial was that which brought every thought into submission to the authority of Holy Scripture, and to the Catholic interpretation of its teaching. 'The theology of Abélard,' even in the judgment of Neander, 'took schism and doubt for its point of departure, and could never wholly repudiate its origin.' Bernard might have taken as his motto, in their most comprehensive application, St. Paul's words to the Latin Christians of his day: 'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God.'¹ The Greek questioning intellect of Abélard would have emblazoned on his banner the same Apostle's words to the Corinthians: 'The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.'²

Nor was the contrast between the two philosophies of Christianity more striking than that presented by the lives of their exponents. To Abélard in early life fame had been as the breath of his nostrils, and the most conspicuous theatre was selected for building up a renown which, after all, was shipwrecked through indulgence in one overmastering passion; whilst the spotless purity of Bernard's youth took early refuge in cloistered retirement, from whence he was drawn unwillingly to take part in European policy. The sweet, yet ardent nature of Bernard, self-subdued by fasting, meditation, and prayer, was the antipodes of Abélard's defiant spirit, which no discipline, however stern, could altogether break, and which would pluck bright honour even from the throne of God. And as the lives and the methods of the two men differed, so did their conclusions. To Abélard faith could never be more than the most probable amidst conflicting rational opinions; to Bernard faith was surer than the surest of all convictions, the deepest and most certain of all certainties.

It followed, therefore, that not only some of Abélard's conclusions, but his whole method of dealing with theology, was repellent to Bernard.

¹ Romans xiii. 1.

² 1 Cor. ii. 10.

'At the very outset of his theology,' writes Bernard, in his appeal against the errors of Abelard to Pope Innocent, 'at the very threshold of theology, or rather of his own stultology, he defines faith to be mere opinion. As if anyone were at liberty to think and to say whatever he pleased of it; as if the sacraments of our faith were suspended uncertainly on vague and various human opinions, and were not rather established on certain truth. If faith wavers, is not our hope too unsubstantial? Then were our martyrs foolish for sustaining such bitter pains for things uncertain, not hesitating to pass through a painful death, into eternal exile, for a doubtful reward! But far be it from us to think, as this man does, that anything in our faith and hope depends upon merely doubtful opinion, and is not rather founded on certain and solid verity, divinely attested by oracles and miracles, established and consecrated by the child-birth of the Virgin, by the blood of the Redeemer, by the splendour of His resurrection. These testimonies are facts too credible for doubt. But were it otherwise, the Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God. How, then, can any one dare to say that faith is opinion: unless he be one who has not yet received the Spirit, or is ignorant of the Gospel or deems it a fable? . . . Far be it from Christian faith to allow such limitations. Such opinions belonged to philosophers whose part it was to doubt about everything and to know nothing. Faith is the *substance* of things hoped for, not the phantasy of idle conjectures. Mark that word "substance" . . . it sets something definite and fixed before you; confines you within settled boundaries, encloses you within certain limits. For faith is not opinion, it is certainty.'¹

We cannot discuss here the question how far Bernard rightly conceived his opponent's position; nor can we enter upon Abélard's early personal history, nor upon the circumstances which led to the first authoritative condemnation of his teaching at the Council of Soissons, A.D. 1121. Nineteen years had passed since that turbulent and precipitate assembly had by its violence aroused a reaction in Abélard's favour, of which the haughty dialectician had taken advantage to republish his audacious speculations upon the Divine Nature, and upon the mystery of sin. Once more orthodoxy took alarm and called upon Bernard to champion its cause, and Abélard eagerly welcomed the opportunity of meeting so redoubtable an adversary. He boldly claimed from the Archbishop of Sens the privilege of appearing at a synod which was shortly to be held in his cathedral city, and of defending his opinions against all opponents.

The council, which met in June, A.D. 1140, was exceptionally brilliant and imposing. The King attended it, surrounded by the magnates ecclesiastical and secular of the realm.

¹ *De Abelardi Erroribus*, cap. iv. sec. 9.

More than one archbishop was present, with numerous suffragan prelates and a crowd of monks and mitred abbots. All that was most intellectual in France—many of them avowed or secret friends of the accused—was gathered to the spectacle. But the combat was too glaringly unequal. On the one side was the keenest and most practised logician of his day ; on the other, a simple monk, dauntless indeed in courage and weighty in the Scriptures, but utterly unversed in the rhetorical arts of the schools. The former invited his friends to share the triumph to which both he and they looked confidently forward. The latter, keenly conscious of his disadvantages, relied only on his unshaken conviction, 'The Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man can do to me.' The outer bearing of the combatants corresponded to their inward dispositions. Abélard strode in, with head erect and a proud mien, startling those who looked on his handsome but worn and scornful face, accompanied by a throng of ardent disciples. Bernard entered alone, with downcast eyes and anxious brow, bestowing his blessing on those who sought it. At length the lists were called, and Bernard commenced the fray. Without preface he handed in a list of heresies, seventeen in number, extracted from Abélard's writings, and asked that they should be read to the assembly. Scarcely, however, had the clerk begun when Abélard stepped forth and bade him desist. He would not hear another word. He appealed to the Pope and straightway left the council, although Bernard earnestly assured him of a courteous hearing, and of his own personal safety. No adequate explanation has ever been given of so sudden and disastrous a surrender ; but Abélard went out in silence a beaten and a broken man. In his absence his doctrines were condemned by the council, whose decision the Pope afterwards confirmed, and the victory of Bernard was complete.

We have but a very little space wherein to notice Bernard's efforts to promote the Second Crusade. All the chivalry of a knightly race, and all the ardour of a loving disciple, combined to inspire him with eager desire that the sacred places should not be wrested from Christian hands. What bent so fitting for the martial spirits of that turbulent age as to spend their strength in repelling the infidel from the gates of Zion ? What disgrace to Christendom more shameful than that the blood so freely shed half a century before in delivering Jerusalem from the Paynim should have been lavished in vain, and that the cross should be torn from the summit of the temple and dragged through

the mire of its streets? 'Bernard had now reached the age of fifty-five years. The freshness of youth and the relative strength of middle life alike had gone. He was worn and broken by weariness and sickness, prematurely old, and increasingly anxious to remain in his convent, and take no further prominent part in public affairs' (p. 553). But at the call of king and pontiff he again came forward, and with characteristic impetuosity carried all before him. Never had the torrent of his eloquence been so persuasive. Never had such evident inspiration breathed through his emaciated form, and flashed from his keen bright eyes. With a statesman's grasp of the situation he devised a permanent force to maintain the Christian hold upon Palestine and to keep the Mahomedans in check, and the warrior monks of Rhodes, the famous Knights Templars, owed to his genius the inception and the discipline of their order. But for the moment it was urgent to send forth a more expeditious armament without delay, and Bernard set himself to work to stir all Western Europe to action. Two years of incessant labour were spent in traversing France and Germany, and everywhere men felt his appeal to be irresistible. When no building was large enough for the multitude that thronged to hear him, the preacher stood on a raised platform to address the assembled thousands, and the effect was electrical. Those who could neither hear nor understand a word he spoke were carried out of themselves by his superhuman energy. Men believed that they were standing before a prophet who delivered his message direct from God Himself, and it was verily a message brought to the birth through an agony of deep heart searchings, and a passion of tears. They would have made him, despite his most earnest resistance, lead the Crusade in person. They thronged for crosses so that the vast number provided proved insufficient, and clothes had to be torn up to form the emblems that should at once stamp on them indelibly their solemn consecration to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

The following description of St. Bernard's magnetic influence may also serve as an example of Dr. Storr's somewhat flowery style:

'Perhaps as striking an instance as any of his power in preaching is that presented by his memorable discourse before Conrad the Emperor. At Frankfort, Bernard had had an audience with the Emperor, but had failed to impress him with the duty or the privilege of taking part in the Crusade. Subsequently at Spire he saw him again, but again without effect. The only answer to be obtained

from him was that he would consider the matter, consult with his advisers, and give his reply on the following day. On that day Bernard officiated at Mass, the Emperor being present. Suddenly, without invitation, moved as he felt by the Divine Spirit, he began to preach. At the end of the discourse, turning to Conrad in the crowded cathedral, and feeling himself as much alone with him as if the earth had swung out of sight and only they two remained to remember it, he addressed him, not as an emperor, but as a man. His whole soul flung itself forth from his impassioned and impetuous lips, and he was for the time as one inspired. He pictured the coming tribunal of the Judgment, with the man then before him, standing there in the presence of the Christ, who imperiously says to him, "O Man! what ought I to have done for thee, which I have not done?" He set forth the height and splendour of royalty, the riches of the Emperor, the wise counsels he could command, his virile strength of mind and body, for all which things he must give account. The whole scene of the tremendous coming assize seemed palpably present to the mind of the preacher, while it flamed as a vision through his prophetic admonitory words. We may well conceive that the cathedral itself appeared to darken in the shadows, and to tremble with the echoes of ethereal thunders, as He who cometh with clouds was foreshown. At last, the Emperor, bursting into tears "in the midst of the discourse, exclaimed, 'I acknowledge the gifts of the Divine favour, nor will I prove ungrateful for them. He assisting me, I am ready to serve Him, seeing that on His part I am so admonished!'" The shout of the people, snatching, as it were, the words from his lips, broke forth in exulting praise to God, and the city resounded with their voices. The Emperor took the holy banner from the hand of the abbot; his nephew, with a multitude of nobles, followed eagerly his example; and the Second Crusade was launched upon its turbulent way' (pp. 416-17).

It were hard to find a more picturesque figure in modern history than the saint whose career we have been thus briefly describing. 'The ornament and support of the whole Catholic Church, and pre-eminently the honour, glory, and joy of the Church in France.' 'At once the leading and the governing head of Christendom.' Such are the terms applied to Bernard by Cardinal Baronius and our own Dean Milman. Nor was he ignorant of the estimate in which he was held by his contemporaries. 'Men say,' he wrote to Pope Eugenius, 'that you are not the Pope but I, and therefore those who have troublesome matters flock to me from every side.' Nor is the secret of Bernard's unique influence hard to unravel. He is a conspicuous example of the power of saintliness in this evil world. Born into what might have seemed a most uncongenial sphere for the exercise of his special powers, confined by his own self-sacrificing choice to the petty cares and narrow interests of a poor and struggling monastery,

intensely reluctant to take any part in public matters which tore him away from his convent chapel and cell, the fire of sanctity that burned within him was so intense that neither its light nor its heat could be concealed, and wherever work was to be done for Christ men felt that he of all men living was the man to perform it. Even godless men could recognize that the spirit which animated him was of no earthly temper. In the passionate self-devotion of himself, body, soul, and spirit, there was no reserve, and, more wondrous still, his spiritual victories never engendered spiritual pity. We may truly say of him what Gregory affirms of Origen, 'that he stirred, quickened, kindled those who approached him. He communicated not his words, but himself; not opinions so much as a fire of love.'¹ And as he had lived so he died. In deepest humility to the last he begged the intercession of friends. 'Be urgent to defend by your prayers one at the last extremity who is destitute of all merits.' With his weeping monks gathered round his bed, he passed, on August 20, A.D. 1153, in the words of one who stood beside him, from labour to rest, from hope to reward, from combat to crown, from faith to knowledge, from the far-wandering to the native home, from the world to the Father.

ART. IV.—ARISTOTLE AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. A. STEWART, M.A.
Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford. Two
Volumes. (Oxford, Clarendon Press: 1892.)

THE more we study the *Ethics* the more strange, in one sense, seems the position it holds. A person who should attempt beforehand to describe the kind of book which would stand as a text-book for centuries would hardly describe the *Ethics*. If it were described to him, he would not unreasonably maintain that the book was without any of the characteristics that a text-book ought to have. The order is confused; the text is difficult; the history of the book is obscure; it is not easy to grasp precisely what the point of view is which is maintained in it; though it professes to be practical in its aim, the amount of practical instruction in it is comparatively small. A text-book, one would imagine, would be clear and precise—would avoid questions leading to no precise solution—

¹ Quoted by Westcott, *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 220.
VOL. XXXVII.—NO. LXXIV. Y

would deal in principles of which the outline was crisp and sharp. The *Ethics*, as everyone knows who has studied it, abruptly dispels all such illusory notions of the ideal text-book, and perplexes us with discussions upon a large variety of subjects, leaving off in the end with an account of happiness which does not at first sight seem to square with that in Book I. And yet, with all its disadvantages, it has a right to the place it has won. The philosophical principles which reveal themselves to careful study and interpretation have a real claim to be regarded as permanent. They are the fruit of deep reflexion upon human life, by a mind exceptionally observant and exceptionally skilled in grasping the universal principle hidden in particular things. It is these characters in the writer which give his work some of the permanence of the best poetry.

But we must be careful what we are saying. For the most popular theory of the origin of the *Ethics* reduces the actual work of Aristotle in them to a very small amount. Like some of the books of the Old Testament, the *Ethics* betrays the handiwork of a variety of authors. The three middle books in particular are largely reproduced in the *Eudemean Ethics*. The seventh book seems to be in inextricable confusion. There are two sections in the treatise devoted to 'Pleasure' which it is not easy to reconcile with one another, and so on, till we are inclined to wonder whether the name Aristotle stands for anything that ever existed in *rerum naturâ*, and whether in reading the *Nicomachean Ethics* we are really holding converse with one of the greatest minds that ever lived, or simply reading the observations of a body of inferior persons sheltering themselves under a great name.

In the work named above Mr. Stewart has avowedly set aside these critical problems in the interests of philosophical interpretation. It is true that he gives us what he calls 'a speculation' as to the way in which the book came together in its present form; but this 'speculative' view does not prevent his treating the book as a whole—illustrating one part of it by another, or by other works which bear the name of Aristotle—and expecting to find the beginning consistent with the end. We are content to follow his example. The questions of authorship and construction are as yet undecided, and the ethical system which has been studied for so many centuries has been got out of this book, treated as a whole. The book has had its value for the world as it stands, and it is as a permanent source of teaching that we are to consider it now. Without, therefore, committing ourselves to one or

another critical theory, we will proceed to inquire what the book tells us as a whole.

Roughly speaking, there are two questions which must be answered as soon as we begin to treat moral life reflectively. We may ask with regard to it, Why are we bound to a certain course of action? What is the ground of moral obligation? Or we may put our question more practically, and inquire, What is the ideally best way of spending life? How can we most successfully attain the good and avoid the evil? Both questions arise when men have already had some experience of the facts of life; when they have learnt that some things are forbidden and some ordained by law or custom; or when they have seen that, as a matter of fact, some men succeed in life, while others fail. Experience sets in motion the spirit of inquiry, and the answer that comes should be practical—an answer that will have a meaning in experience. Aristotle—if we may endeavour to express his position in a single phrase—answers both questions at once. By describing the ideal life he declares the ground of moral obligation. The ideal life is the life which best develops in an organic consensus all the powers of the human being; and the reason why custom and law enjoin this type of life and forbid its contrary is because it is the best—because everything in the universe is constituted on the understanding that it will realize its capacities in the environment in which it is placed. If, then, it be asked why is virtue right and vice wrong, the answer is simply that by means of virtue a man lives a true human life; without it, he fails.

The usual method of setting forth the moral theory of Aristotle in an edition of the *Ethics* is to publish connected essays on the subject. Mr. Stewart has not done this. He thinks that Grant's *Essays* still 'hold the field,' and that his own plan of dealing with questions in notes is better for junior students, who 'can master the *Ethics* only by fighting their way through the problems and difficulties of the treatise as these start up.' There are many advantages about this plan. Even if it involves repetitions, and is in danger of leaving a fragmentary impression upon the mind, it shows how the whole philosophy of Aristotle must constantly be brought up to interpret single passages. It constantly happens that the explanation of a term or phrase really involves the entire attitude of Aristotle's thought towards the world; and the truth of this is only learned by experience. The danger of setting essays is that the subject-matter may be divorced from the text, and 'got up' separately; and if

this happens, the advantage of reading the *Ethics* is almost entirely lost. To understand Mr. Stewart's view of Aristotle's moral system, therefore, we must go to his notes on special passages. For convenience sake, we may perhaps consider Aristotle's views and Mr. Stewart's presentation of them under the following three heads: (1) the environment of the moral life; (2) the moral nature itself; (3) the relation between the two.

I. The environment in which Aristotle places his ideal man is, of course, the *πόλις*. This is simply another way of saying that, for Aristotle, man is by nature social. There can be no question that this is the view from which Aristotle sets out. He speaks of man in the early books always as being in society. He rejects the idea that the self-sufficiency and completeness requires that the ideal man should live the *βίος μονώτης*. He makes *πολιτική* the science which deals with the end of humanity. But at the end of the tenth book there is an apparent change of position. Here Aristotle seems to contrast the lofty and remote seclusion of the *σόφος* with the busy and energetic life of the *πολιτικός*—the man who lives in the society of his fellow-citizens, and is active in the business of the State. Mr. Stewart labours to show that there is no inconsistency between the beginning and the end. In his note on X. vii. §§ 4-7, he writes: Aristotle

'asks us to look at the *θεωρητικός βίος*, not as a separate career, side by side with other careers in the city, but rather as the *form of the πολιτικός βίος*—that is, of all life in the city. . . . The "city" exists for the sake of its "thinkers," but the "thinkers" are no caste apart. They are the leaven in the mass. We must remember that it is of *ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία* that he is speaking here. Pure *θεωρία* constitutes *ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία*. But man cannot engage in this *θεωρία* continuously, or even at intervals, perfectly. Only God can continuously and perfectly. The life of pure *θεωρία* is too high for man, because he is concrete. 'H *τελεία εὐδαιμονία*, then, being beyond the reach of man, he is left with *εὐδαιμονία to the extent of his θεωρία*. . . . This means that *θεωρία* is the *formal element* in his *εὐδαιμονία*. The *σόφος*, as distinguished here from the *δίκαιος*, is this formal element, abstracted and personified for the sake of clearer presentation. . . . The *βίος θεωρητικός* is not a separate life co-ordinate with the *πολιτικός βίος*, but a spirit which penetrates and ennobles the latter.'

The same point is urged in a very interesting note on IX. ix. 5, a passage which emphasizes the necessity of society, even for contemplation. Here a contrast is drawn between the nature of God and that of men.

'The form of God is realized in one Eternal Being; the form of

man in a multitude of contemporary and successive examples. Each individual man realizes himself only by looking away from his own mere particularity, and assimilating into his consciousness the form of man's reason, as other examples—his friends and fellow-citizens—by their cumulative influence, impress it more purely upon him. . . . To contemplate, and in contemplating, to identify himself with, the social life, is a thing which a man can do almost continuously, because his *οὐσία* or *φύσις* is to be a person who sees himself in others, and lives in others. But to identify himself with *νοητά*, which involve no social reference, is a godlike act, which he can only at rare intervals, and for a short time, perform.'

And once more, it is shown in a note (vol. i. p. 397) on the theory of justice as an *ἀλλότριον ἀγαθόν* that Aristotle sets his face against all kinds of 'ethical atomism.' If we are to take the *Ethics* as a whole, and explain the theory in the light of other Aristotelian works, there can be little doubt that Mr. Stewart makes good his case. The passages which apparently imply that the ideal man is to live in academic seclusion are strong when taken alone, but the literal treatment of them can hardly stand against the general drift of the Aristotelian philosophy.¹ Cf. also note on Book V. ii. 11, vol. i. pp. 410-13, especially p. 413.

II. The moral environment, then, is the State. We must next inquire, What is the nature of the being who is to correspond with this environment? Man, according to Aristotle, is a compound organism, consisting of soul and body. It is this concreteness, as we have already observed, which separates his life from the life of God. In God there is only Form, pure Reason, without any materiality or confusion: man is hindered by the presence of a body. His soul also is determined in its special characteristics by its contact with the flesh. In some respects it is akin to the vital principle in plants, and to the sensitive consciousness of animals.

¹ Mr. Stewart notices in several places that neo-Platonists fixed upon these passages, and fathered their mystic quietism upon Aristotle by their means. So, in a note on i. xiii. 5, Mr. Stewart quotes a long passage from Eustratius, 'not as throwing much light on Aristotle's doctrine of τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀγαθόν, but as an interesting example of how Aristotelian doctrines fared under the combined influence of neo-Platonism and Christian asceticism.' It may be worth noticing that the spurious work known as the *Theologia Aristotelis*, which once had a wide circulation, but of which the Greek text has disappeared, ascribes to Aristotle a view of God and the soul which bears the closest resemblance to the philosophy of Plotinus. It contains Aristotelian phrases, such as the definition of the soul in the *De Anima*, but the drift of the thought is neo-Platonic and not Aristotelian. The book claims Porphyry as its translator, and Dieterici, its recent editor, thinks it not impossible that this statement may preserve the truth that Porphyry was its author.

The distinctive feature of the human soul is that these lower capacities are taken up into the service of the higher moral powers of man. Animals act δι' ἐπιθυμίαν and διὰ θυμόν, and their acts are so far voluntary¹ and men when they use these lower principles to guide them act voluntarily. But their true self-expression in act is attained when they rule their whole nature by their reason. The effect of this operation of reason is to steady the man's action. He is no longer the creature of impulse, determined to action by any chance stimulus from without. He has seen the principles of things, and is guided by rational ideas rather than temporary and changeful impulses. It is important, as Mr. Stewart has pointed out, to bear this function of reason in mind, for two reasons especially. Firstly, it wholly prevents the possibility of supposing that Aristotle regarded the desires as essentially evil. He tells us expressly that the aim of both desire and reason is τὸ καλόν, but that this end is attained only if desire and reason work together. Secondly, to use Mr. Stewart's words:

'Aristotle avoids (by his theory) the extreme Socratic position—that virtue is knowledge, and vice consequently involuntary, without surrendering the truth that reason is essential to morality. Morality is the perfection of the form of a given matter. In *plants* their manner of growth—τὸ θρεπτικόν—is the form. *Animals* are conscious of their organisms in the schemata of pleasure and pain; and mere ὁρεῖσις is the exponent of their form, so that whatever thwarts mere ὁρεῖσις is not themselves. Acts done from mere ὁρεῖσις by *man* are his own acts, and voluntary, because in him the sensible nature is the material vehicle of the rational moral nature, and if he is to have credit for achieving the perfect form he must be responsible for acts which hinder its reception—if virtue is in his power, vice must also be in his power' (ii. 108).

And so again later on:

'The acts of the rational agent represent a consistent and single personality to which we always refer them; whereas the acts of the ἀκρατής represent merely the prevalence for the time of certain ἐπιθυμίας, and are regretted and, as it were, disowned by the man 'when he comes to himself again' (ii. 379).

III. The elementary factors, then, in the moral problem are the rational soul of man, operating through a material body, and the social order represented by the conception of the πόλις. We have now to see how Aristotle describes the relation between these two. From what we have already said it will be clear that the environment supplies the matter upon

¹ *Eth.* III. ii. 2.

which the rational soul imposes form. The nature of this correspondence is, of course, the most important question of all. In a long and careful note on the definition of *ἡθικὴ ἀρετή* (i. 200 sqq.), Mr. Stewart describes the process by which this moral form is attained. A man begins in childhood with certain 'natural tendencies to feel pleasure and pain in connexion with the right objects.' Upon these *νόμος* sets to work and produces a provisional '*συμμετρία* of the whole man.' But it is an externally imposed order, and the subjects of the 'educational process' are not aware of what is being done. At last '*φρόνησις*, or the consciousness of the proper relation, dawns in them, and aids *νόμος*, and gradually supersedes it in the function of preserving and perfecting the *συμμετρία*.' This *φρόνησις* makes a man 'his own master.' He has become conscious, not only of the various possibilities of his nature, but of the principle which introduces order into them; it is not simply a virtue, but involves the possession of all the virtues. In the earlier stage of his development the law defined the actions the man was to do or leave undone; it regulated from outside the position he was to hold in relation with all the others. *Φρόνησις* does this from within. The man himself knows when to act and when to hold back from acting, because he has a rational view of himself in his various relations. It is obvious that life in a society of any degree of complexity presents opportunities for action of various kinds. These, considered as producing permanent habits of mind of different types, are the occasions of the virtues and the vices.

'The various virtues, although for greater clearness they may be treated separately, are not separately existent, but each exists only as the others exist, and form an *ὁρθὸς λόγος*, or system, which is different (within limits) for each man. Each man has, as it were, his own moral centre of gravity, and all the virtues, related to one another in a particular way, are necessary to his stability; but his moral stability may be assailed in different ways, in different circumstances. . . . But the centre of gravity remains the same in all, being that particular *λόγος*, or organization, of his whole nature which is best for the particular man.'¹

A difficulty, however, may arise if the question be asked, How is a man to know 'that he is really preserving his "moral balance" and "character"?' The functions of law

¹ Aristotle has chosen to express the idea of virtue by a word, *μεσότης*, which is liable to much confusion. It suggests that his view of virtue was the avoidance of quantitative excess or deficiency. We cannot discuss this criticism at length: the statement of Aristotle's own view is really the best refutation of it.

have been gradually superseded, and, in any case, are hardly sufficient to direct a man's action until he attains *φρόνησις*. Where is he, then, to look for guidance? It seems that Aristotle would have us look to the *σπουδαῖος*—the good man in the concrete—'and watch how he actually tempers his nature.' Thus we have in the end an objective empirical standard as well as a body of theoretical rules. Mr. Stewart argues that this standard would be found always in the society in which our moral life is spent. The *σπουδαῖος* or *φρόνιμος* would be the man who had corresponded with the social conditions, which we share with him, in an eminent manner. He would be 'at home in his own city, and worthy of it.' Hence, in the last resort, 'the maintenance of a beautiful everyday life, according to Hellenic traditions—a life in whose varied activities one takes a personal but not self-aggrandising part—is Aristotle's standard of virtue.'

But there is a further stage still. The *φρόνιμος* is not the ideal. He is 'conscious of the moral law' through his *φρόνησις*, or *practical* insight and 'self-knowledge.' But the *μεγαλόψυχος*, or high-minded man, realizes *αὐτάρκεια* in a fuller sense than this. He possesses 'the highest speculative power. Like Spinoza's ideal, he has the *scientia intuitiva*, and sees in every virtuous act the whole world of human nature clearly, which good men of less speculative power see only dimly.' 'The self-sufficing personality of the *μεγαλόψυχος* inspires reverence. The outward expressions of this reverence are in themselves nothing to the *μεγαλόψυχος*, but he receives them as the gods receive our homage, not because they need it, but because we offer it as the best thing we have to offer.' This character seems to give us Aristotle's ideal. The man who has attained this eminence has done the best with his life; he has realized its possibilities to the full. He is more than virtuous, for virtue is rather a condition or habit of the soul than a type of activity. He is more than *φρόνιμος*, for he has reached the stage of *θεωρία*. His life, therefore, is the sphere of *εὐδαιμονία*.

We hope that we have not misinterpreted Mr. Stewart in this collection of passages from his notes. We have, of course, omitted many things, which no account professing to be complete, either of Aristotle or of Mr. Stewart's edition, could omit. We have said nothing, for instance, of the place of pleasure in the Aristotelian system. It must already have become plain to our readers that Mr. Stewart has a great enthusiasm for his subject, as well as an exhaustive knowledge of it. But it must not be supposed that he is not sensible

of defects in the Aristotelian system. He notes the limits which Aristotle's experience imposed upon his speculation. He shows how the ideas of Hellenic culture occupied the whole horizon of Aristotle's thought, and in one or two places, notably in the case of *ἀκρασία*, he shows that the conditions of Greek thought itself caused the question to be discussed in a dialectical spirit. The various subjects investigated are illustrated sparingly from modern thinkers, but the great bulk of the illustrations come from Aristotle's own works, or from some Greek commentator. We are thus able to see the ethical theory as part and parcel of the general scientific position which Aristotle held. We see how the life of man entered into a universe that was dominated by purpose, and how the purpose became conscious in the mind of the voluntary agent, who by his reason had grasped the universal aspect of things. Again, we see how the system of Aristotle was a real answer to the questions raised by moral philosophy, though it adopted the somewhat humble course of showing that the ideal following out of man's natural constitution was the ideal which every reasonable man should have before him.

And so the question comes round upon us again, Why should this system have lasted so long? It is not exactly an inspiring thought that the whole of the moral struggle and all the complex machinery of the State aim simply at securing that man shall be what his nature rules that he shall be. Questions as to the ground and character of the moral ideal seem to require some further answer than this—to expect that life shall be justified from outside itself, shall serve some further purpose, and be governed from some transcendent source. To all this Aristotle gives a cool and perhaps a prosaic answer. Man's best hope, he says, is to fulfil, in part at least, the laws of his nature and satisfy the conditions of his society. He reserves his rare poetical flights for the description of some lofty philosophical condition, such as the ideal friendship, or the relation of pleasure to *εὐδαιμονία*. For the most part he sticks close to facts; his ideal is simply a rational formulation of every-day life.

It is not, perhaps, difficult to see why Aristotle should have marked a decisive move forward in Greek philosophy. Starting as he did in the school of Plato, he evolved a philosophical vocabulary containing expressions which were sadly needed. Plato had been rather alarmed, and by no means without reason, at those philosophers of flux who were for dissolving all the reality in things. He had endeavoured to

introduce fixity and stability without losing his hold on the empirically real ; but on the whole he had laid too much emphasis upon the fixity, and found it difficult to combine with it that which certainly changed and moved. He had no terms to express with certainty what Aristotle embodied in the distinction between *δύναμις* and *ἐνέργεια*, or in the thought of an immanent *τέλος* expressing itself gradually through a material medium. Aristotle's phraseology, or rather the thought which made his phraseology significant, saved him from half the sophistries which perplexed Plato. It seems strange to us, but to the Greeks the idea of a thing changing its manifestation without changing its nature was somewhat of a difficulty. Knowledge, for instance, must be either complete or non-existent. Thus the problem of the *Meno* is to understand the way in which learning is possible ; the arguments of Socrates seem to end in the position that no acquisition of knowledge is possible at all. It must be there or it can never be acquired. Aristotle's distinction of *δύναμις* and *ἐνέργεια* enables him to surmount this difficulty in a less cumbersome way than by the doctrine of *ἀνάμνησις*, and conveys a principle which is constantly required in philosophy. In the same way the idea of an end or form, which is rather a law of being than a copy or archetype of the phenomenal thing, obviated the difficulties which arose in the practical working of the Ideal Theory. These and similar conceptions were applied by Aristotle, as we have seen, to human life, and therefore we can understand that they would be found satisfactory in their day, and how impossible it would be to do without them. Thus it is that we find almost as much Aristotle as Plato in the *Enneads* of Plotinus. Plotinus looks upon Plato as his great master, but he looks at him not as he actually was but as Aristotle had made him.

Moreover, such philosophical conceptions as Aristotle's are always being wanted in all ages of thought. It is always required to find some formula which will cover the movement from one state to another—which will explain or describe growth. And this is especially the case now, when biology has so largely influenced thought of all kinds. So it is Aristotle's conception of Teleology which is best suited to the expression of the evolution theory in its most philosophical form ; it is difficult to find any modern phraseology so apt to reproduce Aristotle's doctrine of Virtue as that of correspondence with environment. There is, then, no cause for wonder in the dominance of Aristotle over Greek and modern thought. But the adoption by the mediæval Church of Aristotle's moral

doctrine does seem a strange adventure. A large portion of the *Ethics* is embodied in the second part of the great *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas; even the order of the Aristotelian book is in many parts closely followed. Is there no change here? Is Aristotle allowed to speak without modification? Has Christianity nothing to alter or improve in Aristotle?

Over the greater portion of this second part of the *Summa* the differences between the philosopher and the schoolman seem to be chiefly differences of language and method. In its scholastic dress there is but little room for the uncertainties and incompleteness which we notice in Aristotle's philosophy. Everything is fixed and scientific. The language is technical and precise, and the writer evidently counts on a public who will appreciate it. There is no literary interest whatever discernible anywhere in the book. But as regards the nature of virtue St. Thomas is closely in agreement with Aristotle. He connects it closely with nature and with reason. 'Virtutes sunt dispositiones quibus homo convenienter disponitur in ordine ad naturam.'¹ Even the lower elements in man are under the influence of reason, which moulds them into a harmony of the whole man. 'Vires sensitivæ dupliciter possunt considerari: uno modo secundum quod operantur ex instinctu naturæ, alio modo secundum quod operantur ex imperio rationis.'² Also, the virtues cannot stand alone: it is impossible to have one without the others. They differ because the occasions which suggest them differ, but they belong to a rational unity. Further, they are habits, and are produced by action of a certain kind, starting from a basis of natural tendency. And they are in the mean; but this does not imply any quantitative associations; 'virtus moralis . . . habet rationem medii; in quantum passionem reducit ad regulam rationis.'³ It is possible to attain to moral without intellectual virtue, in the narrower sense of philosophy and science. But *prudentia*, which is in a somewhat different sense an intellectual virtue, 'quam maxime necessaria est homini ad bene vivendum.'⁴ In all this we are quite in an Aristotelian atmosphere, though we find that St. Thomas had adopted a new scheme of the virtues. He starts from the basis of the four cardinal virtues, with which the Republic has made us familiar; and the various virtues in the Aristotelian scheme are arranged under these four heads. In one or two cases this involves more than a merely formal

¹ *Prima Secunda*, Q. cx. A. iii.

² *Ibid.* Q. l. A. iii.

³ *Ibid.* Q. lxiv. A. i.

⁴ *Ibid.* Q. lvii. A. v.

change, but not always. The system is more rigid, but the theory is much the same.

So far, we have considered the ground which both thinkers cover. But it is almost unnecessary to remark that this does not exhaust the whole moral theory of St. Thomas. The schoolman had to bring within the limits of his system the Christian revelation of the life to come and the specially Christian views of moral life. As regards the former, he finds much of the more transcendental language of Aristotle ready to his hand. He applies to the life to come much that is said by Aristotle of the life of contemplation, which is too high for man to reach; and thus he reconciles the apparent inconsistency of Aristotle by connecting the two ideals with two different spheres of being. But this is not all. He has to introduce the grace of God as a factor in his moral system, and together with this there comes considerable change. For it is this divine element which leads to a distinction wholly foreign to the Greek mind—between habits acquired and habits infused. We can readily understand that the three theological virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity, belong to the class of infused habits. They are the gift of Heaven, since their object transcends the limits of the nature of man. But these are not merely an addition extraneously made to an ordinary human nature; there are also infused habits connected with the cardinal virtues. These infused habits differ from the cardinal virtues as practised in ordinary life. And they differ in virtue of the change of object which has been imposed upon them. In other words, the whole of life, the whole complex of rights and duties, is transmuted under the influence of the divine grace. Temperance, for instance, is not merely a restriction of the bodily desires, according to the rule of reason, to preserve health or the free exercise of the mind; it involves that a man should 'keep under his body and bring it into subjection.' And as the virtues of citizens vary according to the constitution of their state, so there is a special type of virtue belonging to the fellow-citizens of the saints.¹ This distinction is a far-reaching one in the system of St. Thomas. It explains to his mind the fact that 'natural' virtue is possible up to a certain point without the divine *caritas*, and without the more distinctive gifts of the divine grace.² It is perhaps the widest and most important difference between him and Aristotle.

But in two other respects there is a serious difference. The range of Aristotle's virtues is enormously extended, and

¹ *Prima Secunda*, Q. lxiv. A. iv.

² Cf. *ibid.* Q. lxv. A. ii.

the excesses and defects are treated far more positively as sins than was possible to the Greek mind. As soon as the general conception of virtue has been defined, and the questions arising out of it decided, St. Thomas proceeds to the definition of sin and the exposition of its causes and effects. Thus, though temperance, for instance, is defined much as Aristotle defined it, there are included in the list of sins connected with it a number of things which have only the remotest relation with the thought of Aristotle. There are, says St. Thomas, three parts in any cardinal virtue: (1) the integral parts, *i.e.* the necessary conditions to the existence of the virtue; (2) the subjective parts, *i.e.* its species, the various modes in which it is manifested; (3) the potential parts, *i.e.* allied states in somewhat different subject-matter, like humility as compared with temperance. These varieties with their opposites are all set forth and discussed; and though the language of Aristotle appears in the course of the discussion, it must be confessed that St. Thomas leaves his thought far behind. It must not, however, be supposed that the extension of the range of these virtues is purely formal. St. Thomas carries through the principle involved in the Aristotelian definition with the keenest insight; and it would be difficult, we think, to read through the discussion of any one of the cardinal virtues without feeling admiration at something far more dignified than ingenuity.

In one case, there is a serious departure from the Aristotelian point of view, and we propose to speak of this somewhat more in detail. It is in connexion with *magnanimitas*, the Aristotelian *μεγαλοψυχία*. We have already given some account of this as it is in Aristotle, and it will be remembered that the *μεγαλόψυχος* represents Aristotle's ideal. In St. Thomas he meets with a grievous fall, and is reduced to a subordinate character under the head of *fortitudo*. St. Thomas is not himself responsible for this change, which was first made by the Stoics;¹ but it causes a great disturbance in the Aristotelian theory, and we are bound to admit that St. Thomas seems to be wholly unconscious of the distortion he is producing.

After four articles on the character of *magnanimitas*, which follow closely the doctrine of Aristotle, St. Thomas raises the question *utrum magnanimitas sit pars fortitudinis*. As usual in the *Summa*, reasons are offered against the position; but it is authoritatively decided by the authority of Macrobius and Andronicus. St. Thomas then gives his own

¹ *Diog. Laert. VII. i. 92.*

reasons. We have already decided, he says, that it belongs to a principal virtue to establish in some principal subject-matter, some general type of virtue. *Firmitas animi* is one of these general types or methods of virtue, and this is the conspicuous mark of those virtues which tend towards some difficult object; notably, therefore, in fortitude. He then proceeds to argue that *magnanimitas* strengthens the heart *in maximis bonis sperandis vel adipiscendis*; and that it is therefore inferior to fortitude, by which men have strength to brave danger and death. In two following articles he illustrates two kinds of *magnanimitas*—*fiducia* and *securitas*. It is impossible to avoid feeling that St. Thomas has been misled by the ambiguity of the word *animus* to connect this virtue with fortitude, and to illustrate it as he has done. But at the same time there is a real kinship between the possessor of *fiducia* and Aristotle's *μεγαλόψυχος*. Both of them are largely indifferent to the world's censure or applause. But the one is so because he looks down with sovereign contempt upon those who are less favoured than he, and because he is at the head of society as he knows it; the other is so because he is sure of the hope that is in him. Mr. Stewart remarks that *μεγαλοψυχία* is a virtue belonging to a stationary culture. May we not say that its analogue in St. Thomas is characteristic of a man who felt himself *in via*, moving towards the *patria*?

From this very slight sketch some notion may perhaps be gained of the agreement and difference between Aristotle and St. Thomas. We think that both are significant in regard of the question we raised at the beginning of this article. Both throw light on the importance and value of the system of Aristotle. The great central point of difference seems to us to be this, that Aristotle displays before us objectively the picture of the ideal man engaged in reaction upon certain definite and known conditions, whereas St. Thomas, by his doctrine of infused habits and of the gifts of the Spirit, offers us the subjective ground of the moral life. There is no picture at all in St. Thomas of an ideal figure; in the *Summa* we deal simply with universal principles arranged in scientific order. And this in spite of the close adhesion of St. Thomas to the books of Aristotle. And, on the other hand, in spite of all that Aristotle says of *αὐτάρκεια*, of the necessity of the inward motive to the completeness of the outward act, we are, in the last resort, told to look out upon the *σπουδαῖος* for our example, and to take the tone of society for our guide. This is really the distinctive difference be-

tween pre-Christian and Christian ethics. It is the analogue in the pagan development to the law among the Jews. The law enforced certain practices from without, though it never failed to inculcate also a spiritual attitude towards its own precepts. But it never got within the circle of the personal life; it knew of no means to operate upon the will and make obedience possible to it. And so, too, the system of Aristotle remains outside the man. It endeavours to operate on him by various means—by law, the influence of friends, education public and private, the example of the *φρόνιμος*. But the influences are all external; the individual, though he is in necessary relation with them, is an impenetrable atom, over against whom they range themselves. With the principle of grace, in the sense of St. Thomas, this difficulty is obviated. A force has appeared from without which does not remain without, but operates directly upon the will. It is not a command, but an auxiliary power, disposing the soul to conformity with the external precept. By its operations it brings to light the real nature of the soul, its real correspondence with the rational law of good; the moral habits, in technical language, are infused. And this is not a violent or compulsive activity, because it does not impose principles which are essentially at variance with human nature; it reconstructs from within the ideal form, which had been marred, and was in danger of being lost.

And here we come across a point of close agreement between the Greek and Christian philosophies. Both are clear that virtue is the ideal, but also the natural, state of man. The pursuit of virtue is no exceptional abnormal activity; it is the most natural expression of man's powers and capacities. The reason of man, realizing the true conditions of human life, decides that the laws of right and wrong are not arbitrary but intelligible; and that means that it is satisfied to identify itself with the law, satisfied that it represents the true ideal of human nature. On this head St. Thomas is as decisive as Aristotle, and so, we think, everyone must be who holds that the ideal of humanity has been historically realized under the conditions of the actual world. St. Thomas, as we have seen, allows the possibility of a partial satisfaction of the rational demands of human nature to those living under heathen conditions; but, of course, he limits the range of such success. It is possible that he marks too inexorably the separation between the two, and he certainly in no way anticipates the modern conceptions of an evolution of morality. But it is a significant fact that both he and

Aristotle start from the conception of human nature and the ideal purpose immanent in it.

We think that it will be chiefly in his defence of the naturalness of the human ideal that the secret of Aristotle's permanent value may be sought. It is not that he has said the last word upon the questions he raises; or that his practical principles are beyond criticism; or that his moral ideal entirely exhausts the possibilities of human nature. And as for the book itself we may almost say that the absence of literary form is in some sense a gain; it means that there is the less room for misunderstanding, less chance of the stereotyped use of poetical phrases—dangers to which the peculiar form of Plato's writing has made his philosophy particularly liable. And then, again, the very narrowness of the environment which Aristotle has in view makes it easier to appreciate the play of the forces which he represents in correspondence with it. These are, however, but the accidents of his moral philosophy. The real interest of it lies in the fact that he deals securely and sanely with the facts of life; and describes, in a philosophical language of unsurpassed dexterity and flexibility, the general conditions of man's life in society. The social aspect of things has changed; we have given up, for instance, either allowing or defending the practice of slavery; the city-state has vanished in a wider national unity. But the essential character of human life remains the same. It is still true that man is by nature social, and that the true end of his being is found when this social nature is allowed its full development. We venture to hope that any who may be led to refer to St. Thomas Aquinas will not think that the philosopher has made the schoolman unnecessary. St. Thomas is difficult and awkward in form, and sometimes unconvincing. But still he has things to say which his great predecessor could not have anticipated, and they demand expression. For, after all, Christian ethics can never be quite the same as pagan. There must be much ground common to the two, for both start with the same human nature. But there is no region of human experience in which Christianity has produced more and more vital differences than in morality. It has changed the motive and the range and the end of moral life, and it has done so in virtue of the new truth and the new vital power which it has poured into the world. There have been times when it has seemed as if the attractiveness of classical ideals has blinded men to their limitations. And, in the present day, there are influences at work tending to

withdraw men from the advanced position of Christianity towards the narrower standing-ground which ancient morality supplies. The best corrective to such a tendency is, we are sure, to study the ancient moral systems as they are; to enter, for instance, into the mind of Aristotle and understand his greatness and his defects. We shall not be disposed to throw aside his book as being beneath our notice; but we shall feel, nevertheless, how far we have travelled since his days.

ART. V.—A SERVICE BOOK OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

1. *The Antiphonary of Bangor.* An Early Irish Manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. Edited by F. E. WARREN, B.D., F.S.A. Part I. A Complete Facsimile in Collotype, by W. GRIGGS, with a Transcription; accompanied by an Introduction descriptive of the History and the Palæography of the Manuscript. (Printed for the Henry Bradshaw Society). (London, 1893.)
2. *Ueber Columba von Luxeuil's Klosterregel und Bussbuch.* Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der philosophischen Doctorwürde der Universität Leipzig. Vorgelegt von OTTO SEEBASS. (Dresden, 1883.)

IT is now nearly two hundred years since Antonio Muratori brought forth to light from among the treasures of the Ambrosian Library a certain MS. service-book, which he called 'Antiphonarium Benchorense,' and published, together with other matter, in vol. iv. of his *Anecdota Ambrosiana* (Patavii, 1713). And now the Henry Bradshaw Society has given us something more than a new edition of this MS.; it has brought out a photographic facsimile of the whole MS., with a most accurate transcription of the text, upon the production of which it is evident that neither pains nor expense has been spared; and a second volume is promised us which will contain an edited and annotated text with notes, in which all possible light will be thrown upon the use of the book itself, as well as the services for which it was compiled.

As we scan the beautiful collotype facsimiles, in which we seem to be gazing at the pages of the very MS. itself, and think of the priceless MS. treasures of our public libraries and the continual possibility of their destruction by fire (a

risk which can never be entirely obviated even by the most excellent system of precautions), we are at a loss to understand the apathy of the trustees of our public libraries, and of the world of scholars in general, in the face of so possible a calamity, and their indifference to so easy a method of circumventing the foe, and rendering comparatively harmless even the destruction by fire of one of these MSS., as the putting forth of photographic reproductions of all our greatest treasures. Why could not a photographic department be established as part of the permanent establishment of at least the British Museum, if not of other great libraries, in which it should be the duty of the officials of the department to superintend the production of good photographic representations of rare MSS.? The book before us shows, not only what may be done in this way, but how greatly the reproduction of some MSS. at least would be appreciated by the scholarly public.

The Bangor MS. in question is eminently worthy of so costly a presentment on many grounds. Not only is it one of the earliest of all existing liturgical MSS., but in respect of its use as a service-book it stands in a class entirely by itself. How many MS. service-books of the seventh century remain to us? Reckoning neither plain Psalters which possibly had a liturgical use, nor fragments of Lectionaries which are extant in the form of a series of titles in the margins of MSS. of the Gospels and Epistles, we recall the following: one Lectionary (*Luxoviense*), one mixed Missal and Lectionary (*Sac^m. Bobiense*), the fragmentary Masses published by Mone (*Lateinische und Griechische Messen*), with possibly two other Missals (*M. Gothicum* and *Sac^m. Gelasianum*, published by Thomasius), the probably unofficial *Sac^m. Leonianum*, the set of Collects published by Dr. Ceriani (*Il Rotolo opistografo*, &c.), and possibly the *Orationale Gothicum* of Verona, published by Bianchini.¹ So far as we are aware, there is no other MS. service-book of this period belonging to the Hour-Services, except the *Orationale Gothicum*.² This alone would be sufficient to render this volume one of exceeding interest. But the MS. deserves consideration on even more important grounds. Not only is it the

¹ It will be noticed that nearly all of these belong to the Gallican Services.

² Except a portion of the congeries of books massed together under the title of *Breviarium Gothicum*. We believe that *part* of these are connected with services of the earlier monastic type, although they represent a somewhat late survival of the older kind of service.

sole remaining service-book of the Celtic Church for any service unconnected with the Mass, but we believe that it is no exaggeration to state that it is the solitary surviving service-book belonging to the daily round of devotion which ascended from the vast and numerous monasteries of the West before their antiquated Rules and Courses of cumbrous fashion were obliterated by the flowing tide of the Benedictine Rule and Course.

We know that there were monks in the West before St. Benedict, and yet we are sometimes apt, notwithstanding, to practically ignore all previous monastic history, and to forget that before St. Benedict there existed an earlier planting, whose seed was drawn from Egypt and the Thebaid, and brought over to the West by many hands, and notably those of Cassian—a type of monasticism which spread rapidly over Gaul and Spain, and extended itself even to Ireland. This earlier monastic system continued for some time to flourish alongside of the Benedictine tree, but it ultimately withered and died before the fresher stock; its monasteries passed under the sway of the new Order; the notes of its ruder psalmody were silenced by the majestic Roman chant; its service-books and customs disappeared; and now there remain only the Rules of its great leaders—Cæsarius, Aurelian, Columban, and others—Rules treating of the monastic life, and containing regulations (only too few) for the conduct of the Divine Service. As we peruse these monuments of ancient piety, and read the history of these monasteries of primæval type, the story of the lives of their founders, of the incredible numbers of their monks, of their struggles and their devotion—with now and then a touch of human nature (not to say human infirmity) that enables us, even in these days of universal luxury, to realize our kinship with the stern disciples of Cæsarius and Columban—what would we not give to be able to don the garb of the wandering monk, to travel backward through the centuries, to beg for a few days the hospitality of the brethren of Arles, of Lerins, of Tours, of Bangor, and to assist at some of those holocausts of monastic piety in which the treasures of the Psalter were poured forth with lavish devotion, and the summer night seemed all too short for the glad offering of praise? What would we not sacrifice for a full and detailed account of the cycle and order of the Divine Service in some one of those early monasteries of the West—for a set of their service-books? The information which we can gain from the Rules, and from allusions and descriptions in patristic literature, falls sadly short of our

desires ; in the so-called Antiphonary of Bangor we have a service-book, indeed, but (of course) nothing in the way of rubrical direction as to how to use the various Collects and Hymns and Antiphons contained in it, except the meagre details given in the titles of these devotional elements. Here are collections of Hymns, Canticles, Collects, and Antiphons ; how were they used ? It may seem an impossible task to attempt to discover this in the absence of more detailed directions or descriptions ; but let us nevertheless make the attempt, trusting to the indulgence of our readers, and in the belief that even a tentative solution may have a real value, as being the only possible step to any permanent result ; and that if we cannot reconstruct the complete cycle of the Bangor services—a task which we confess to be beyond our power—it will be of some use to indicate the kind of service which was in use, and to show how the various devotional elements in the Antiphonary of Bangor were (with greater or less probability) intended to be used.

We would endeavour, first, to bring into prominence the fact—well known to those who have bestowed attention upon the Rules—that the type of the Hour-Services presupposed and alluded to in them is of a character radically different from that of the services included in a Roman or Benedictine Breviary. Each Rule (and even every monastery) had its own round of services, differing to some extent from every other ; but amid all this individual variation we shall not fail to recognize a similarity of general type, a family resemblance with the services described in Cassian's *Institutes* : a type of services in itself strictly monastic, but having some relationship (as is natural) to the secular services which obtained at the same period in secular churches—services of a character similar to the original Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites,¹ but very different from the ordinary mediæval services, whether of Rome or France or England, to which our forefathers were accustomed.

In endeavouring to picture to our minds the services of the old monks of Arles, of Tours, of Bobbio, or Luxeuil, we must seek for light upon the customs of any one Monastery or Rule, (1) from the similar customs of Rules of a kindred nature, and (2) from the unadulterated portions of the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Breviaries ; and we must guard ourselves very carefully from false parallels and misleading analogies drawn from the Gregorian or even the Benedictine Breviary. It is necessary to insist at starting upon this

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, xxiii. 108.

obvious principle, because we are so unaccustomed to any Hour-Services which are not of the familiar Roman type that it becomes extremely difficult to divest ourselves of the unconscious assumptions and expectations engendered by constant usage, and to imagine services and customs of a different character from those with which we are familiar.

Let us turn first to the Rule of Columban. The seventh chapter, which contains the directions for Divine Service, has been expounded with great patience and judgment in the learned monograph by Dr. Seebass mentioned at the head of this article,¹ for the knowledge of which we are indebted to the late Dr. Hort, whose marvellous acquaintance with theological literature of every kind was always at the disposal of his friends. The chapter presents a problem of unusual difficulty, on account of the crabbed character of the Latin employed—a difficulty which seems to have exercised an unconscious influence upon the German of the learned doctor.

We propose to give the text of chap. vii. of the Rule (omitting digressions which add nothing to the description of the services), with an interpretation founded upon that of Dr. Seebass, prefacing it with a few necessary remarks.

(1) The text is that given in Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra* (Louvain, 1666), with some alterations in punctuation. Holsten (*Codex Regularum*, Pariseis, 1663) gives a text less trustworthy, and apparently 'improved,' but occasionally useful as a commentary. Dr. Seebass makes some use also of the readings of two other MSS. from Menard's edition of Benedict of Aniane's *Concordia Regularum*.

(2) This chapter of the Rule is (according to Dr. Seebass) *entirely absent* from some MSS. Dr. Seebass accounts for this by supposing that Columban promulgated two versions of his Rule, the earlier of which did not contain this chapter; we would suggest with diffidence the possibility that this chapter is due, at least in part, not to Columban himself, but to the subsequent piety of his disciples. The slipshod arrangement of the chapter, in which the writer travels inconsequently back and fro, with a tantalizing disregard of method, appears to suggest that the chapter itself is not all of a piece, but that occasional additions have been rather unskilfully patched upon the original text.

(3) The 'Course' meant the regular and consecutive recitation of the Psalter, and directions concerning it apply

¹ We are greatly indebted to Dr. Seebass for his exposition of this chapter. His remarks upon the Antiphony of Bangor are not so profound. We had arrived at our own conclusions independently.

to those services at which this consecutive recitation was carried on. In the case of Columban's Rule, we shall see that the term *Cursus* is applied exclusively to the order of the psalms at one particular service, the *Vigilia Matutina*, which was the most important service, because at it the greatest number of psalms was said.

(4) The nights before Saturday and Sunday, the 'holy nights,' had a different arrangement of psalmody at this *Vigilia Matutina* from that on the other nights of the week, the number of psalms being much greater on these two nights—a monastic version doubtless of the early Christian *pervigilia*.

(5) The Rule appears to contemplate *four seasons* of three months each—November, December, January constituting *winter*, and so forth.

(6) In the Rule *antiphona*=*chora* [not *chorus*; cf. Rule of St. Donatus]=*psalta*; and the word does not here mean only the *refrain* to a psalm, but retains its original meaning of a psalm or set of psalms (in this case a set of *three* psalms) sung antiphonally, *i.e.* with the refrain intercalated after each verse or group of verses.¹

Of the
Course and
the Canonical
Services.

The Course
to vary in
length.

The Course
on the 'holy
nights' in
autumn and
winter.

On the other
nights in
winter.

C. vii. *De Cursu Psalmorum.* De Synaxi ergo, id est de cursu psalmorum et orationum modo canonico, quædam sunt distinguenda, quia varie a diversis memoriæ de eo traditum est. Ideo juxta viarum qualitatem ac temporum successionem varie a me quoque literis idem insinuetur. Non enim uniformis esse debet pro reciproca temporum alternatione; longior enim per longas noctes, breviorque per breves esse convenit. Inde et cum senioribus nostris [*apud seniores nostros*, H.] ab viii. Calendas Julii, cum noctis augmento sensim incipit crescere cursus, a duodecim choris brevissimi modi in nocte Sabbati sive Dominicæ usque ad initium hiemis, id est Calendas Novembris; in quibus viginti quinque canunt antiphonas psalmorum ejusdem numeri duplicis qui semper tertio loco succedunt psaltis [*numeri, qui semper tres loco duobus succedunt psalmis*, H.]; ita ut psalterium inter duas supradictas noctes numero contineat [H. *has totius psalterii* for *psalterium* and *numerus* for *numero*]; duodecim choris cæteras temperantes tota hieme noctes.

The 'Course' is distinguished from the 'Canonical Services.'

The Course of Psalms is to vary in length, more psalms being sung in the long winter nights than in the short summer ones. Beginning with the Course on the holy nights (*i.e.* the nights before Saturday and Sunday), the shortest

¹ Dr. Seebass does not seem to be quite clear upon this point.

allowance of psalms on these nights (in the summer) is twelve anthems; after Midsummer the Course is increased by degrees until the beginning of winter is reached, on November 1, by which time *twenty-five* anthems are sung on each of these nights, thus completing the whole Psalter on the two holy nights of each week; and this amount is understood to continue in use on these two nights during the whole of the winter (*i.e.* November, December, January). We confess that we cannot make anything satisfactory out of the words 'eiusdem numeri . . . psaltis.' Seebass would read *triplicis* for *duplicis*, and *tres* for *tertio*—the latter after other MSS.—understanding the twenty-five anthems to include thrice as many psalms, three psalms belonging always to an anthem. It is necessary that three psalms should belong to each anthem *during the winter* in order that, as here stated, the whole Psalter may be completed in two nights; and this equation (of one anthem = three psalms) is supported by the Rule of Donatus and the present Rules in other places, besides other usages which might be adduced. Nevertheless we are not quite satisfied that there is not some deeper corruption of the text; and it is just possible that some custom of having only two psalms in each anthem *during the summer* (cf. II. Council of Tours, can. xviii.) may be alluded to in the corrupt wording of this passage.

On the other nights of the week (*i.e.* excluding Saturday and Sunday) throughout the winter twelve anthems are sung, *i.e.* thirty-six psalms.

The Course on the 'holy nights' in spring. (Winter and summer Course on other nights.)

Qua finita, per ver sensim per singulas hebdomadas terni semper decedunt psalmi, ut duodecim in singulis [*sanctis*—one MS. followed by Seebass] noctibus tantum antiphonæ remaneant (id est, quotidiani hiemalis triginta sex psalmi cursus, viginti quatuor autem per totum ver et æstatem et usque ad autumnale æquinoctium, id est viii. Calendas Octobris, in quo similitudo synaxeos est sicuti in vernali æquinoctio, id est in viii. Calendas Aprilis) dum per reciprocas vices paulatim crescit et decrescit. . . .

After the last short remark about the winter Course on ordinary nights, the Rule returns to the Course on the 'holy nights.' After winter is over (*i.e.* after the end of January), one anthem (including three psalms) is dropped each week until, at the end of April, only twelve anthems (*i.e.* thirty-six psalms) remain, which is the same number as the winter Course on ordinary nights. The Course on the holy nights is understood to remain at the same number of anthems, *viz.* twelve, until June 24, just as in winter it remained at the same

number of twenty-five anthems. The incidental allusion to the winter Course on ordinary nights leads on to the remark that the *summer* Course on ordinary nights consists of only twenty-four psalms, *i.e. eight* anthems (cf. the Rule of St. Donatus, which, as regards the Course, was founded on that of his master, Columban). We have enclosed all this parenthetical portion in brackets, as on the mention of the equinoxes the Rule seems to return to the alternate waxing and waning of the Course *on the holy nights*. We cannot agree with Dr. Seebass, who understands *in quo similitudo synaxeos*, &c., to refer still to the Course on ordinary nights, and is therefore obliged to imagine a complicated waxing and waning of the psalmody on ordinary nights, and to interpret *per totum ver* in a non-natural sense.

The Canon-
ical Services
of

the Day-
Hours.

Sed quia orationum canonicarum noscendus est modus, in quo omnes simul orantes horis convenient statutis, quibusque absolutis unusquisque in cubiculo suo orare debet. Per diurnas terni psalmi horas pro operum interpositicne statuti sunt a senioribus nostris cum versiculorum augmento intervenientium pro peccatis primum nostris, deinde pro omni populo Christiano, deinde pro Sacerdotibus et reliquis Deo consecratis sacrae plebis gradibus, postremo pro eleemosynas facientibus, postea pro pace regum, novissime pro inimicis ne illis Deus statuatur in peccatum quod persequuntur et detrahunt nobis quia nesciunt quod faciunt.

At each of the 'Day-Hours' three psalms are prescribed, with the addition of versicles between [Collects?], forming an intercession for various objects, to the consideration of which we shall return presently. The number of Day-Hours is not stated in the Rule, but (if we may trust the Antiphonary of Bangor) they were—*ad Secundam, ad Tertiam, ad Sextam, ad Nonam, ad Vesperas*.

Nocturn I.
Nocturn II.
Mattins.

Ad initium vero noctis duodecim psalmi, ad mediumque noctis duodecim similiter psalluntur: ad Matutinum vero bis deni bisque bini per tempora brevium, ut dictum est, noctium sunt dispositi; pluribus jam, ut dixi, nocti Dominicæ ac Sabbati vigiliæ deputatis, in quibus sub uno cursu septuaginta quinque sigillatim cantantur. Hæc juxta communem dicta sunt synaxim.

After the regulation of the Day-Hours (with their *Preces*) the Rule passes naturally to the Night-Services. Of these there is a daily service *ad initium noctis*, at which twelve psalms were used, another similar service daily at midnight,

and a service *ad Matutinum*, at which twenty-four psalms were said in the shortest nights, and more at other times. And here the Rule refers us for the number of psalms at this service to the previous portion of the chapter; and it is apparent that the complicated 'Course' described at the beginning of the chapter referred only to the psalms used at this particular service—the *Vigilia Matutina*. This conclusion is re-enforced by the words *sub uno cursu*, by which the provision of (sometimes seventy-five) psalms given at the beginning of the chapter is shown to have reference to *one* service, and not to be divided between several. Indeed, the series of services without the *Vigilia Matutina*, seems to form a complete whole in itself, and it appears possible that the order of the psalms at the two Nocturn-Services (*ad initium noctis* and *ad medium noctis*) formed another Course, independent of the Course *ad Matutinum*, upon an earlier model (*v. Cassian, De Instit. lib. ii. c. 4*), to which the Course at Mattins was superadded.

It must be observed that the service *ad initium noctis* in this and similar arrangements (Cassian, as above; *Regula cujusdam*, and *cf. the service ad duodecimam* from *Regula Aurel.*); is not Vespers, for it is similar in structure to the midnight service (see also the Antiphony of Bangor, where *ad Vesperas* and *ad initium noctis* are different services); neither is it Complin, for the same reason, and also because it is a public and principal service, and is found in very early ages, before Complin had been invented. The services *ad initium noctis* and *ad medium noctis* are really two similar services which may be appropriately considered as first and second Nocturns. Vespers is apparently on a similar footing with regard to the Course as the other hours of the day—with psalms that varied no more than those of Tierce, Sexts, and Nones; it did not fill so important a place in the *ordo psallendi* as either Roman or Benedictine Vespers, which contribute to their respective Courses. (The Day-Hours are never included in the Course in Rules of this character.) After some general considerations relating to devotional exercises, the Rule concludes with a descriptive reference to another Course to which that of Columban is preferred.

The complete order of the services under the Rule of Columban was therefore as follows:

- (a) At each of the Day-Hours (probably *ad Secundam*, *ad Tertiam*, *ad Sextam*, *ad Nonam*, and *ad Vesperas*) daily—three psalms, with the Intercessions.
- (b) *Ad initium noctis*, daily—twelve psalms.
- (c) *Ad medium noctis*, daily—twelve psalms.

(d) Ad Matutinum:

On ordinary nights, in autumn and winter—twelve anthems (=thirty-six psalms); in spring and summer—eight anthems(=twenty-four psalms).

On the nights before Saturday and Sunday, in November, December, January—twenty-five anthems (=seventy-five psalms); in February, March, April, 25, 24, 23, &c.—12 anthems in successive weeks; in May and to June 24—twelve anthems (=thirty-six psalms); June 24 to end of October, 12, 13, 14—24, 25 anthems, in successive weeks.

It will be observed that an anthem cannot be added in *every* week between June 24 and November 1, because if this were done we should add eighteen anthems instead of the necessary thirteen; but a parallel irregularity can be found in the Rule of St. Donatus. It seems so natural to have begun the increase in the number of anthems with the beginning of August, in which case the thirteen weeks before November would have just fitted the thirteen anthems required, that Professor Seebass concludes that they did not begin actually to increase the number of anthems until August, and that from June 24 to August 1 the increase in the length of the service was carried out in some other way. He suggests that this was done by selecting longer Psalms; but this suggestion is inadmissible, as the idea of a *course* precludes that of *selection*. The monks went through the whole Psalter over and over again, in the night-services.

Let us turn now to the Antiphony of Bangor. On pp. xxix. and xxx. of the Henry Bradshaw Society's beautiful edition, is a Table of Contents of the MS. with the sections numbered in a way that will be very convenient for the purposes of the present article.¹ Let us observe first that we must not expect to find the arrangement of the Prayers and Hymns in a MS. like this carried out with systematic exactness. Besides the ordinary errors of transcription—misplaced or omitted words, titles, and Collect endings—the scribe would supply omitted or additional Collects in any place that suited

¹ We could wish that the sections had been numbered *exactly* as in the MS., and that where two or three Collects and Anthems are given under one heading in the MS.—through accidental omission of titles, or from other causes—they had not been numbered consecutively as §§ 48, 49, but had been numbered 48 a, 48 b. We say this because in the present edition, while *some* of the untitled Collects are correctly distinguished and provided with titles, *others* are not, and therefore the numeration will have to be done over again.

his own convenience, and miscellaneous items would be added in blank spaces—as *e.g.* at the end of the main divisions of the book—and the same thing might have happened in the MSS. from which the present volume was copied. The editor of the present volume has distinguished with minute carefulness the handwritings of many different scribes, but (apparently) all of the same, or nearly the same, date.

Turning, then, to the Table of Contents, p. xxix., and anticipating somewhat for the sake of convenience, we see that the book consists of the following main divisions :

- (a) A collection of Hymns and Canticles, §§ 1-15.
- (β) Collects at the Day-Hours (two series), §§ 16-39.
- (γ) Common Forms of Intercession (= *Preces*) at the Day-Hours, §§ 40-56.
- (δ) Collects at Sunday Lauds (seven sets), §§ 62-94.
- (ε) A Collection of Antiphons, §§ 95-115.

To these divisions was added an Appendix of miscellaneous devotions, containing :

A Hymn (*Gloria in Excelsis*), § 116.

A shorter version of the *Preces* of the Day-Hours, §§ 117, 118, 119 (also § 124).

Additional Collects at the Day-Hours, §§ 120, 121, 122 (also 127?)

Collects at Lauds after *Te Deum*, §§ 123, 125, 126.

A Memorial Hymn, § 128.

Moreover, besides this Appendix, promiscuous items have been tacked on to Divisions (γ) and (δ). §§ 57-60 are an alternative set of Collects for the midnight Nocturn and Matins, possibly given here because one of the former sets (§§ 37-39) was imperfect (§ 59 is a mere repetition of § 39). The § 95 (*Versiculi familie Benchuir*) seems to occupy a similar position with regard to Division (δ) as § 129 (*Memoria abbatum nostrorum*) does with regard to the volume—and there is a similarity in the character of these two sections. §§ 96 and 97 are odd Collects, which would naturally be expected in Division (γ), but form here an appendix to Division (δ). Besides these, §§ 34-36 consist of portions of the Mass (Anthems of the Peace, Creed, Lord's Prayer), which are evidently in a wrong connexion in this place, occurring as they do between Collects *ad initium noctis* and *ad Nocturno (sic)*.¹ It would appear as if

¹ We think there can be little doubt that these three sections belong to the Mass, and not to the Hour-services. For (1) they probably belong together, since they interrupt an otherwise continuous series; (2) the Pax certainly belongs to the Mass, the instances of its use at the 'Hours' being too slender to bear any weight; (3) the Creed was but

our volume had been transcribed from four (or five) different *libelli*, corresponding to the Divisions (α), (β), (γ), (δ), (ϵ), and that these Appendices had been found by our scribe at the beginning or ends of at least *two* of these *libelli*.

Before endeavouring to discover the purpose of the book and the use of its various parts, we must examine the MS. and satisfy ourselves as to whether it is probably complete: whether any leaves are interpolated in wrong positions, or misplaced, or missing. The editor of this MS. has given us every assistance towards determining this most important question. (Would that all editors of MSS. had been equally generous!) By the help of the plate opposite p. xviii., and by comparing this with the contents of the separate leaves, we may see that the only places where leaves can have been lost are between fols. 17 and 18, and between 29 and 30. The heading *In nomine Dei summi* marks in all probability the beginning of the book, while the 'appendix-nature' of the contents of the last four leaves makes it extremely improbable that anything has been lost at the end. If any leaves have been lost between ff. 17 and 18, we see by comparing the Collects on these folia that they must have contained one or more series of Collects *ad horas diurnas*, similar to the two series in the MS.; this is possible, particularly as the gathering seems to want another sheet, and it would affect but slightly the interpretation of the liturgical use of the MS.; but the problem connected with ff. 29 and 30 is more difficult, and we cannot avoid connecting with it the problem of the three single leaves (ff. 7, 8, 9) *interpolated* between ff. 6 and 10. That ff. 6 and 10 were originally intended to be consecutive is shown by the fact that *Benedictus* which is begun on fol. 6 v. is finished on fol. 10 r.; but how have ff. 7, 8, 9, found their present position? Not by a common binder's blunder, for in this case how came these Canticles to be written on three single leaves? They appear to have been written *for the express purpose of insertion in this place*, and thus to mark an alteration of plan in the arrangement of the service-book. Turn now to fol. 29. We might at a first glance suppose that the Collect *super Cantemus Domino* (§ 94) was the first of an eighth series of Collects similar to the seven series immediately preceding, and that the leaves

recently (we may say) introduced into the Mass, and we have no evidence of so early a use of it at the Hour-services, but rather the contrary; and (4) the order of the three sections corresponds exactly with their order in the Gallican Liturgy.

containing it had been cut or lost, except a fragment of one of them, fol. 29; but this cannot be the case, for fol. 29 v. is blank, instead of containing (as it would in this case) a portion of one of the subsequent Collects of the supposed series. It appears, therefore, that fol. 29 was never more than a fragment, and it seems probable that the insertion of this fragment has to do with the same alteration of plan in arranging the volume which necessitated the insertion of ff. 7, 8, 9. The first scribe (A)—v. Introd. § 16—apparently intended *Cantemus* and *Benedicite* to come in the MS. after the Collects at Sunday Lauds (Division δ); but the second scribe (B), who began to write at fol. 26 v., altered the original plan (for a reason which we shall attempt to assign presently), and instead of inserting *Cantemus* and *Benedicite* after § 94, wrote these on separate single leaves (they are by the same scribe B) and inserted them between fols. 6 and 10.

We find no trace of any other missing or transposed leaves, and therefore we are satisfied that the volume is complete—with the one possible exception noted above.

Turning again to the 'Table of Contents' of the MS. and observing the position in the MS. of the marginal crosses, which (with one exception) mark the beginning of a subdivision of the MS., or of a *series* of Collects or anthems, we note that division (δ) consists of *seven series* (more or less complete) of Collects in the following order:

	SERIES						
	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.
<i>post Canticum 'Cantemus Domino'</i>	62	68	71	76	81	88	91 94
<i>post Benedictionem trium puerorum</i>	63	69	72	77	82	89	92
<i>post tres psalmos (Pss. 148-150)</i>	64	70	73	78	83	90	93
<i>post Evangelium</i>	65	—	74	79	84-85?	—	—
<i>post Hymnum</i>	66	—	75	80	86	—	—
<i>de Martyribus</i>	67	—	—	87	—	—	97

These Collects evidently give the main elements of *some* liturgical service, and it is not difficult to see that this service must have been very similar to the Ambrosian Sunday Lauds. For the main elements of the Ambrosian service are almost identical with the series above, *Benedictus* being added at the beginning, and Ps. 116 (A. V. 117) to the three Laud-psalms, and a *psalmus directus* being inserted before the hymn.¹ In old editions of the Breviary, *Gloria in Excelsis* (with following Versicles) is found before the hymn, and a few Gospel-lessons are assigned to Mattins (*i.e.* Lauds) among the (? 9th c.) lesson-titles in the margin of the Codex

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 108.

Mediolanensis of the Gospels recently edited by the Bishop of Salisbury and the Rev. H. J. White (to whose kindness we are indebted for a transcript of these titles), which show the previous existence of a Gospel-lesson at this service. (Of course the series of Collects above prove nothing negatively: they show only those elements of the service which are accompanied by Collects). In the Ambrosian Lauds, *Cantemus*, *Benedicite*, and (sometimes) the Laud-psalms are accompanied by Collects, which, however, precede, instead of following, their respective canticles. The Mozarabic Sunday Lauds is constructed on the same general lines as the Ambrosian; in it *Benedictus* has not been added, but we find *Cantemus* (now exchanged out of Eastertide for another canticle which varies with the season), *Benedicite*, and the three Laud-psalms. There is also a Prophetic-lesson remaining, and in the ancient Mozarabic Lectionary (*Liber Comicus*) published by the learned Dom G. Morin, O.S.B. as vol. i. of *Anecdota Maredsolana*, we find on some days a Prophecy, Epistle and Gospel appointed for Mattins (*i.e.* Lauds)! The Mozarabic Offices are of the same family as the Ambrosian; hence it appears probable that both the Ambrosian and the Bangor Lauds, on Sundays, as well as the Mozarabic, had originally three lessons—Prophecy, Epistle, and Gospel; and this is supported by the fact that we find Prophecy, Epistle, and Gospel expressly enjoined (though for different services) in other ancient Rules—in the Rule of Cæsarius for Nocturns, and in that of Aurelian for Tierce on Saturdays, and during Eastertide—which Rules exhibit services of a kindred type to those of Columban.

The Rule of Cæsarius enjoins also *Te Deum* and *Gloria in Excelsis* for Sunday Mattins, and that of Aurelian enjoins *Te Deum* for Saturdays and *Gloria in Excelsis* for Sundays at the same service. We have not yet shown that *Benedictus* or *Te Deum* were used at Bangor, but glancing back to Division (a) of the MS. we see that §§ 4-7 are *Benedictus*, *Cantemus*, *Benedicite*, *Te Deum*—the last headed by the first verse of Ps. 111 [112], *Laudate pueri Dominum: laudate Nomen Domini*, and entitled *Ymnum in die Dominica*. Is it too daring a flight of imagination for us to see in these §§ some of the elements of the same service which Division (δ) of the MS. has already prepared us to expect—the Laud-psalms being omitted, as already contained in the Psalter?

We shall give in parallel columns a synopsis of Sunday Lauds from the Ambrosian rite (restoring the Gospel lesson in brackets, and *Gloria in Excelsis*), the Bangor Anti-

phony, and the Rule of Cæsarius of Arles; and shall then attempt a reconstruction at length of one of the Sunday Lauds of the monks of Bangor.¹

AMBROSIAN	BANGOR	ARLES
<i>Benedictus</i>	<i>Benedictus</i>	<i>Ps.</i> 144 [A. V. 145]
{ <i>Collect with</i> <i>Cantemus</i>	{ <i>Cantemus</i> <i>Collect</i>	<i>Ps.</i> 117 [A. V. 118]
{ <i>Collect with</i> <i>Benedicite</i>	{ <i>Benedicite</i> <i>Collect</i>	<i>Cantemus</i>
{ <i>Collect with</i> <i>Pss.</i> 148-150, 116	{ <i>Pss.</i> 148-50 <i>Collect</i>	<i>Ps.</i> 145 [146]
	[<i>Prophecy</i>]	<i>Benedicite</i>
	[<i>Epistle</i>]	
[<i>Gospel-lesson</i>]	{ <i>Gospel-lesson</i> <i>Collect</i>	<i>Pss.</i> 148-150
	{ <i>Te Deum with</i> <i>Capitellum</i> <i>Collect</i>	<i>Te Deum</i>
{ <i>Gloria in Ex.</i> <i>w. Capitella</i>	[{ <i>Gloria in Ex.</i> <i>w. Capitella</i>]	<i>Gloria in Ex.</i>
<i>Ps. directus</i>		<i>Capitellum</i>
<i>Hymn</i>	{ <i>Hymn</i> <i>Collect</i>	
<i>Kyrie</i>	?	
{ <i>Psallenda</i> <i>(de Sanctis)</i> <i>Oratio</i>	{ <i>Ant. de Martyri-</i> <i>bus</i> <i>Collectio</i>	

The Sunday Lauds in the Rule of Aurelian is very similar to that of Cæsarius, but more psalms are enjoined, and *Magnificat* is substituted for *Te Deum*.

SUNDAY LAUDS AT BANGOR.

Dominus vobiscum. *℟.* Et cum spiritu tuo.²

BENEDICTIO ZACHARÆ.

[*Antiphona* . . .]. *Ps.* Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel: quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suæ, &c. (§ 4.)

¹ We have modified the spelling and punctuation, and have introduced a few necessary emendations into the text. Some corrupt passages are still in need of kindly conjectures.

² And probably before each element of the service. Cf. Ambrosian.

CANTICUM.

Antiphona. Educti ex Egypto patres nostri et pertransierunt pedibus Rubrum mare dixerunt laudem Domino nostro. (§ 99.)

Ps. Cantemus Domino, gloriose enim honorificatus est : equum et ascensorem projecit in mare, &c. (§ 5.)

Collectio. Deus qui exeunti ex Egypto populo tuo maria divisisti et suspensis utrinque marginibus in specie muri erigi fluentia jussisti, animas quoque nostras a diluvio peccatorum liberare digneris, ut transire vitiorum gurgitem valeamus hoste contempto : Salvator mundi qui cum æterno Patre visis dominaris ac regnas cum Spiritu Sancto in sæcula sæculorum. *Iy.* Amen. (§ 62.)

BENEDICTIO PUERORUM.

Antiphona. Tres pueri in camino missi sunt, et non timuerunt flamman ignis : dixerunt laudem Domino nostro. (§ 99.)

Ps. Benedicite omnia opera Domini Dominum : ymnum dicite et superexaltate eum in sæcula, &c. (§ 6.)

Collectio. Exaudi preces nostras omnipotens Deus, et præsta ut sicut in decantato hymno beata puerorum instituta sectamur, ita tuo munere peccatorum laqueis absoluti æterni ignis non ambiamur incendiis : Salvator mundi qui cum Patre visis dominaris ac regnas cum Spiritu Sancto in sæcula sæculorum. *Iy.* Amen. (§ 63.)

TRES PSALMI.

Antiphona. De cœlis Dominum laudate : psalterium jucundum immolate : laudate eum in sono tubæ. (§ 100.)

Ps. Laudate Dominum de cœlis : laudate eum in excelsis, &c. (*Pss.* 148, 149, 150, e Psalterio.)

Collectio. Te Dominum de cœlis laudamus, tibi ut canticum novum cantare mereamur : te Dominum in sanctis tuis venerabiliter deprecamur ut omnia vota nostra suscipias, peccata dimittas : Salvator mundi qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. Amen. (§ 64.)

LECTIO PROPHETICA?

• • • • •

LECTIO DE APOSTOLO?

• • • • •

LECTIO DE EVANGELIO.

Collectio. Exsultantes gaudio pro reddita nobis hujus diei luce omnipotenti Deo laudes gratiasque referamus, ipsius misericordiam obsecrantes ut diem Dominicæ resurrectionis nobis solemniter celebrantibus pacem et tranquillitatem [et] lætitiā præstare dignetur ; ut a vigilia matutina usque ad noctem clementiæ suæ favore protecti exsultantes lætitiā perpetua gaudeamus per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum sanctum, &c. Amen. (§ 65.)

HYMNUS IN DIE DOMINICA.

Laudate pueri Dominum : laudate nomen Domini. Te Deum laudamus, &c. . . . usque.

Per singulos dies benedicimus te : et laudamus nomen tuum in æternum et in sæculum sæculi. Amen.

Capitellum. Fiat Domine misericordia tua super nos : quemadmodum speravimus in te. (§ 7.)

Collectio. Te Patrem adoramus æternum : te sempiternum Filium invocamus : teque Spiritum Sanctum in una divinitatis substantia manentem confitemur. Tibi Trinitati laudes et gratias referimus. Tibi uni Deo incessabilem dicimus laudem. Te Patrem ingenitum : te Filium unigenitum : te Spiritum Sanctum a Patre [et Filio]¹ procedentem corde credimus. Tibi inæstimabili incomprehensibili omnipotens Deus gratias agimus, qui regnas in sæcula. *℟.* Amen. (§ 125.)

[HYMNUS] AD MATUTINAM.

Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis. Laudamus te . . . &c. . . .

Capitella. Quotidie benedicimus te et laudamus nomen tuum in æternum et in sæculum sæculi. Amen.

Dignare Domine die ista sine peccato nos custodire.

Benedictus es Domine Deus patrum nostrorum ; et laudabile et gloriosum nomen tuum in sæcula. Amen.

Miserere nobis, Domine, miserere nobis.

Verba mea auribus percipe Domine : intellige clamorem meam.

Intende voci orationis meæ, rex meus et Deus meus. Quoniam ad Te orabo : Domine mane et exaudies vocem meam.

Mane oratio mea præveniet te Domine.

Diebus atque noctibus, horis atque momentis. [*℟?*] Miserere nobis Domine.

Orationibus ac meritis sanctorum tuorum. [*℟?*] Miserere nobis Domine.

Angelorum archangelorum patriarcharum prophetarum. [*℟?*] Miserere nobis Domine.

Apostolorum martyrum et confessorum atque universi gradus sanctorum. [*℟?*] Miserere nobis Domine.

Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto : et nunc et semper et in sæcula sæculorum. Amen. (§ 116.)

HYMNUS AD MATUTINAM IN DOMINICA.

Spiritus divinæ lucis gloriæ,

Respice in me Domine.

Deus veritatis, Domine Deus Sabaoth, Deus Israel,

Respice in me Domine.

Lumen de lumine, referimus Filium Patris,

Sanctumque Spiritum in una substantia,

Respice in me Domine.

Unigenitus et Primogenitus,

A te obtinemus redemptionem nostram.

Respice in me Domine.

¹ Later addition.

Natus es Sancto Spiritu ex Maria Virgine
In idipsum in adoptionem filiorum qui tibi procreati ex fonte vivunt,
Respice in me Domine.

Heredes et coheredes Christi tui in quo et per quem cuncta creasti,
Quia in predestinatione a sæculis nobis est Deus Jesus qui nunc cœpit.
Respice in me Domine.

Unigenito ex mortuis Deo obtinens corpus Claritatem Dei manens (*sic*)
In sæcula sæculorum rex æternorum.
Respice in me Domine.

Quia nunc cœpit qui semper fuit naturæ tuæ, Filius divinæ lucis
gloriæ tuæ ;

Qui est forma et plenitudo divinitatis tuæ frequens.
Respice in me Domine.

Personam unigeniti et primogeniti
Qui est totus a toto, diximus lux de lumine.
Respice in me Domine.

Et Deum verum a Deo vero esse confitemur
Tribus personis in una substantia.

Respice in me Domine. (§ 12.)

Collectio. Sancte Domine, illuminatio et salus vera credentibus,
resurrectio Dominicæ claritatis, illumina cor nostrum ut Trinitatis
scientia et Unitatis cognitione filii lucis et membra Christi ac tem-
plum Sancti Spiritus esse mereamur : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *Kyrie.* Amen. (§ 66.)

[*Kyrie eleison quoties ?*]

MEMORIA DE MARTYRIBUS.

Antiphona. Post ignes et laminas, cruces atque bestias sancti cum
magno triumpho vehuntur in regno et in refrigerio.

Collectio. Hi sunt Domine qui felici cruore perfusi, dum blandi-
entem mundi hujus illecebram gloriosa passione despiciunt, mortem
morte vicerunt, considerantesque tenebras hujus lucis certo termino
ac fine ruituras, sumpserunt de pœna vitam et de morte victoriam.
Rogamus te Christe ut eorum precibus adjuvari mereamur quorum
consortes esse non possumus ; per te Christe qui cum Patre vivis
dominaris et regnas in sæcula sæculorum. Amen. (§ 67.)

In the above it will be noticed that we have made the
assumption that this service of 'Lauds' is that usually called
'Mattins' in the ancient Rules, and referred to in titles and
rubrics as 'ad Matutinam.' This would ordinarily need no
explanation, as it is well known that 'Mattins' was the
ancient name for the service which is now commonly called
'Lauds,' and that it is a misnomer to apply the term 'Mattins'
to the Nocturns-services ; but the curious point in the present
case is that, not only is no hint of any such service as this
Bangor 'Lauds' to be found in the Rule of Columban, but
an entirely different Mattin-service is described at length—

viz. the *Vigilia Matutina*, which was the longest and most important of all the round of services. This difficulty, however, does not, on consideration, appear to us insuperable. In the first place, it will be observed that only to a very small extent can we check the Antiphonary of Bangor by the Rule of Columban, because these two authorities have very little in common. It is not that they are contradictory, but rather complementary: for while the Rule is almost entirely concerned with the course and order of the psalmody and yields hardly anything in the way of a description of the services, the use of the Antiphonary is to supply just those parts of the services which were not in the Psalter. Again, the nomenclature of the 'Hours' was as yet in a fluid state; the 'Lauds' was still little more than a comparatively unimportant supplement to the morning vigil; and so (as we believe) the words *ad Matutinam* and similar expressions covered both the *Vigilia Matutina* and the Laud-service, which (at least, on Sundays) followed it immediately.¹

We must make a few remarks upon some other doubtful points.

It is not certain that *Te Deum* belonged to this service, and the fact that the Collects belonging to *Te Deum* are not included in the series which we have called Division (δ) makes against it. On the other hand, we have no really early and good authority for assigning *Te Deum* to any other service (except the Rule of St. Benedict, in whose round of services—as in the Roman—*Te Deum* seems to be exotic rather than indigenous), and the peculiar position of the Collects belonging to it falls in with the theory (to be presently mentioned) that both *Benedictus* and *Te Deum* were later additions to the original 'Lauds.' From an opposite point of view it may be urged that *Te Deum* is the 'Hymn' referred to in the Collects *post hymnum* of Division (δ), and that therefore the hymn *Spiritus divinæ lucis* should have no place in this service; but it appears to us a sufficient reply to this to point to the wording of the Collects *post hymnum*. We find in these no allusion to *Te Deum*; and when we compare the wording of the Collects that follow *Cantemus, Benedicite, Te Deum*, it will appear incredible that the monks who filled the Collects which belonged to every other hymn or canticle with allusions to its wording should have made a singular exception in the case of *Te Deum*: nay, more, in the particular Collect *post hymnum* which we have given above

¹ Compare the expression *vigilia solemnitas* in § 73, which is one of the Collects at 'Lauds.'

we perceive a not doubtful dependence upon the wording of the hymn *Spiritus divinæ lucis* itself.

We should like to call attention to the very interesting text of *Te Deum* and *Gloria in Excelsis*, and to compare the latter with the text of the same hymn (with its versicles) from the eleventh century Ambrosian *Antiphonale Missarum et Officiorum* (Addit. MSS. 34209), recently purchased by the British Museum. One cannot fail to be struck by the remarkable '*Gloria et honor Patri et Filio*,' &c. in which the Bangor Use agrees with the Mozarabic, nor with the (apparent) relic of a Litany among the versicles at the end of this hymn: and English Churchmen will feel a just satisfaction in the additional proofs afforded by this ancient service-book, that where the Prayer Book differs from the modern Roman custom, it is in many cases because the Prayer Book (whether through accident or design matters not) follows the more ancient and laudable practice. For example, we find in this MS., as in the Prayer Book, the ancient and full form of *Benedicite*, the use of *Te Deum* at the Mattin-service and not after Nocturns; and (here, as elsewhere) the use of the term Mattins as the name of the morning service in later times called 'Lauds,' and not as the name of the services of the night-vigil.

Before we leave this interesting 'Lauds,' we must return for a moment to the question of the position of the single-leaves (fols. 7, 8, 9), containing *Cantemus* and *Benedicite*. It is clear that the present position of *Cantemus* and *Benedicite* in the MS. is not the position which they were originally intended to occupy—probably not the position which they occupied in the MS. from which our service-book was copied. *Benedictus* was (originally) in the MS. followed by *Te Deum* and *Sancti Venite*; and *Cantemus* and *Benedicite* had some other position—probably at the end of Division (8). This original difference of position seemed to show that *Benedictus* and *Te Deum* were not originally used to accompany *Cantemus* and *Benedicite* at Lauds—cf. the Ambrosian Lauds, in which *Benedictus* appears to be a later addition taken over from the Mass. At what service, then, were *Benedictus* and *Te Deum* used? *Benedictus* was used (as is well known) in the Mass in the old Gallican Liturgy, which it is practically certain was used in Ireland; and we would offer the suggestion that the original purpose with which all three hymns—*Benedictus*, *Te Deum*, and *Sancti Venite*—were inserted in the MS. from which the Antiphonary of Bangor was copied, was to serve at the Mass as a kind of layman's *Ordinarium Missæ*—the three hymns in the MS. following each other in

the natural order, supposing *Te Deum* intended to be sung during the *Immolatio*, or Great Thanksgiving. We put forth this suggestion with great diffidence, and subject to the discovery of evidence as to the original use for which *Te Deum* was composed; but the whole wording of this hymn and its evident origin in the Gallican 'Immolatio' (see *Church Quarterly Review*, xviii. 1) afford a basis for the hypothesis that it was originally composed for the Mass and not for Divine Service.¹

The hymn *Gloria in Excelsis* is also probably a later addition to the original Bangor 'Lauds,' as it is not included in the set of hymns and canticles [Division (a)], but only in the Appendix at the end of the book. In the MS. seven sets of Collects are given for 'Lauds.' For what occasions are these intended? There are several allusions to the Resurrection of Christ, and several to baptism. Two hypotheses may be suggested, (a) that these services are for the seven Sundays of Eastertide; or (b) that they are simply seven 'Laudes Dominicales' to be used in rotation for all Sundays in the year. The allusions to the Resurrection do not decide the matter, for in the Rule of Aurelian we find the Resurrection celebrated every Sunday by the reading of a lesson of the Resurrection from the Gospels as the first of six lessons at Nocturns (cf. the Gospel-lesson at Sunday Mattins in the Greek rite); and the allusions to baptism seem also hardly conclusive. Perhaps Collects originally composed for Eastertide (or even for Easter Day) may have found an extended use on ordinary Sundays.

Let us turn now to Division (γ) of the MS. Here we have what we should now call *Preces communes ad horas*, and here we find ourselves on ground common to the Antiphonary and to the Rule. By referring to chapter vii. of the Rule as given above (p. 344) it will be seen how close is the agreement between the directions of the Rule and the actual devotions given in the service-book. The prayer for benefactors comes in a different order in the two authorities; and we may perhaps see in the prayers which are given in the service-

¹ 'Traditur siquidem, Paulinum Foriuliensem Patriarcham sæpius, et maxime in privatis Missis, circa immolationem sacramentorum, hymnos vel ab aliis vel a se compositos celebrasse.' Walafid Strabo, *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, c. 25. If the Paulinus here mentioned by Walafid Strabo is the Paulinus who was Patriarch of Aquileia A.D. 557-69, this tradition recorded by Walafid may have some value; but it is quite possible that Walafid is referring to a later Paulinus, who was Patriarch A.D. 787-802.

book, although not mentioned in the Rule, a legitimate amplification of the original design which had developed itself in the seventy or eighty years that had elapsed since the Rule was set forth.¹ Besides this, some of the prayers in the Antiphonary are obviously for special occasions only, and the last one—*pro pœnitentibus*—seems to be a kind of afterthought, and would probably be said (when required) before the *Collectio Completoria*. We have ventured to call the last Collect by a name found in the *Orationale Gothicum*, as (both because the title *Collectio* is applied to this Collect alone, and from the internal evidence of its wording) it appears to us intended to sum up and conclude the preceding petitions, and would therefore be said by the abbot or presiding senior. Each of the Intercessions consists of usually one Versicle or *Capitellum*,² followed by a very short Collect.

These 'Preces' were said at all the Day-Hours, at each of which three psalms were sung, one of these *ad Secundam* (equivalent to Prime) being Ps. 89 (A.V. 90). 'Lauds' seems not to be included in this description, but rather to be viewed (as we have seen before) as a supplement to the *Vigilia Matutina*. Hence these 'Preces' would not probably be used at 'Lauds.'

ORATIO COMMUNIS FRATRUM. (§§ 40-56.)

Versiculus 1. Ne memineris iniquitatum nostrarum antiquarum, cito anticipat nos misericordiæ tuæ : quia pauperes facti sumus nimis.

[*Vers.* 2?]. Adjuva nos Deus salutaris noster propter gloriam nominis tui : Domine libera nos et propitius esto peccatis nostris propter nomen tuum.

Vers. 3. Ne tradas bestiis animam confitentem tibi : animas pauperum tuorum ne obliviscaris in finem. Respice in testamentum tuum, Domine.

Oratio (unicuique horæ congruens) tribuenda ex Orationibus ad horas diurnas [Div. β] : e.g. *ad Secundam* (*in secunda hebdomada*?). Exaudi nos Domine supplices tuos, qui in hac hora prima diei referimus tibi gratias Domino Deo nostro qui nos redemisti tuo

¹ On the other hand, in §§ 117, 118, 119, we see a later curtailed form of the same 'Preces,' which has deviated widely from the directions of the Rule. In the introduction into this form of the Lord's Prayer, which appears to be intended as an *Oratio Completoria*, there may possibly be traced the influence of the Council of Gerona, A.D. 517, to which we believe is due the introduction of the Lord's Prayer into the Mozarabic Vespers and Mattins.

² The Rule of Columban speaks of '*Versiculi*,' the Rule of Aurelian of '*capitellum*,' and in particular of the *capitellum* '*Fiat Domine*' with which *Te Deum* (in the Bangor book) concludes. For this term, compare the *Capitula* [*psalmorum*] in the Ambrosian offices.

sancto sanguine, ut preces ac petitiones nostras vice primitiarum tibi oblatas pie clementerque suscipias; qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *℟.* Amen. (§ 27.)

PRO PECCATIS NOSTRIS.

Versiculus. Deus in adjutorium meum intende: Domine ad adjuvandum me festina.

Oratio. Festina Domine liberare nos ex omnibus peccatis nostris: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *℟.* Amen.

PRO BAPTIZATIS.

Versiculus. Salvum fac populum tuum Domine, et benedic hereditati tuæ: et rege eos et extolle illos usque in sæculum.

Oratio. Miserere [Domine] ecclesiæ tuæ catholicæ quam in tuo sancto sanguine redemisti: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *℟.* Amen.

PRO SACERDOTIBUS.

Versiculus. Exsurge Domine in requiem tuam; tu et arca sanctificationis tuæ. Sacerdotes tui induantur justitiam, et sancti tui [exultent].

Oratio. Lætentur in te Domine omnes sancti tui qui sperant in te in omni veritate: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *℟.* Amen.

PRO ABBATE.

Versiculus 1. Dominus conservet eum et vivificet eum et beatum faciat eum in terra.

[*Vers.* 2?]. Dominus custodit te ab omni malo: custodiat animam tuam Dominus.

Vers. 3. Dominus custodiat introitum tuum et exitum tuum: ex hoc nunc et usque in sæculum.

Oratio. ?

PRO FRATRIBUS.¹

Versiculus. Custodi nos Domine ut pupillam oculi; sub umbra alarum tuarum protege nos.

Oratio. Protegere et sanctificare digneris omnibus (*sic*) omnipotens Deus: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *℟.* Amen.

PRO FRATERNITATE.

Versiculus. Tu Domine servabis nos et custodies nos a generatione hac et in æternum.

Oratio. Exaudi orationes nostras pro fratribus nostris ut illis Deus miserearis: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

¹ The absence of a Collect *pro Abbate* both here and in the shorter version (§§ 117, 118, 119) suggests the query whether this intercession should not be joined with the preceding, and entitled *Pro Abbate et Domo*. In any case the brethren in this Intercession are the brethren of the particular monastery; the *fraternitas* of the next being the whole brotherhood either of monks in general or of those living under the same Rule.

PRO PACE POPULORUM ET REGUM.

Versiculus. Dominus virtutem populo suo dabit : Dominus benedict populo suo in pace.

Oratio. Pacem præstare digneris omnibus omnipotens Deus : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

PRO BLASPHEMANTIBUS.

Versiculus. Domine misericordia tua in sæculum : opera manuum tuarum ne despicias.

Oratio. Domine Deus virtutum ne statuas illis hoc in peccatum : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

PRO IMPIIS.

Versiculus. Judica illos Deus, decident a cogitationibus suis ; secundum multitudinem impietatum eorum expelle eos, quoniam irritaverunt te Domine.

Oratio. Confundantur illi qui confidunt in se : et non nos Domine qui confidimus in te : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

PRO ITER FACIENTIBUS.

Versiculus. O Domine saluum fac : O Domine bene prosperare.

Oratio. Prosperitatem itineris præsta tuis famulis ; qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

PRO REDEUNTIBUS.

Versiculus. Confiteantur tibi, Domine, omnia opera tua, et sancti tui confiteantur tibi.

Oratio. Tibi gratias agunt animæ nostræ pro innumeris beneficiis tuis, Domine : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

PRO ELEEMOSYNAS FACIENTIBUS.

Versiculus. Dispersit, dedit pauperibus ; justitia ejus manet in sæculum sæculi ; cornu ejus exaltabitur in gloria.

Oratio. Eleemosynas facientibus in hoc mundo retribue Domine in regno tuo sancto : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

PRO INFIRMIS.

Versiculus. Et clamaverunt ad Dominum cum tribularentur : et de necessitatibus eorum liberavit eos.

Oratio. Tribue Domine tuis famulis sanitatem mentis et corporis : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

PRO CAPTIVIS [?]

Versiculus 1. Exsurge Domine, adjuva nos ; et redime nos propter nomen tuum.

Versiculus 2. Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.

Oratio. Salvare nos digneris per invocationem sancti tui nominis : qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. *R.* Amen.

DE MARTYRIBUS.

Antiphona [*petenda infra ex Antiphonis*]. Hi sunt qui venerunt ex magna tribulatione et laverunt stolas suas et candidas eas fecerunt in sanguine Agni. (§ 102.)

Oratio. Deus qui sanctis et electis tuis coronam martyrii præstisti, te oramus Domine ut eorum meritis obtineamus veniam qui tantam gloriam non meremur: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. R. Amen.

PRO TRIBULANTIBUS.

Versiculus 1. Ad te Domine clamabo, Deus meus ne sileas a me.

Versiculus 2. Dominus virtutum nobiscum: susceptor noster Deus Jacob.

Oratio. Adjutor noster Deus Jacob, miserere nobis Domine: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. R. Amen.

COLLECTIO COMPLETORIA [?]

Sanctus in sanctis, Agnus immaculatus, gloriosus in cœlis, mirabilis in terris, præsta nobis Domine secundum magnam misericordiam tuam Deus quæ te petimus et oramus: qui regnas in sæcula sæculorum. R. Amen.

After this follow another prayer *de Martyribus* and a versicle and prayer, *pro pœnitentibus* (apparently). These are very possibly added by way of Appendix to be used in their proper place—viz. before the *Collectio Completoria*; or this position (*after the Collectio Completoria*) may be the true position of the commemoration of the Martyrs, and the Collect given above (with the Antiphon) may be out of its right position.

These Intercessions appear to us of very great interest, not only for their intrinsic devotional beauty, but because they seem to indicate a possible solution of a liturgical problem, viz. the origin of the ordinary *Preces* which followed the Lord's Prayer at the Day-Hours on ferias, according to the Sarum and most other Breviaries. It is generally understood that the only Prayer used in the old Roman office was the Lord's Prayer, which was replaced in later times on Sundays and festivals by the Collect for the day. On ferias the Lord's Prayer maintained its original position, but the *Preces* which follow it have the appearance of a rite introduced from some other source; and the contrast between the ferial and festival prayers seems to indicate a compromise between two rival customs. The separate versicles of the *Preces* form undoubtedly a series of Intercessions; these have now usually neither titles nor separate Collects, but the former of these seem to be preserved 'in solution' in (probably older) forms

of the *Preces*, such as that to be found in the Sarum Litany, where (after *Pater Noster*) we find the following *Preces* :

Ostende nobis Domine misericordiam tuam. Et salutare tuum da nobis.

Et veniat super nos misericordia tua Domine. Salutare tuum secundum eloquium tuum.

Peccavimus cum patribus nostris. Injuste egimus, iniquitatem fecimus.

Domine non secundum peccata nostra facias nobis. Neque secundum iniquitates nostras retribuas nobis.

Oremus pro omni gradu Ecclesiæ. Sacerdotes tui induantur justitiam, et sancti tui exultent.

Pro fratribus et sororibus nostris. Salvos fac servos tuos et ancillas tuas : Deus meus sperantes in te.

Pro cuncto populo Christiano. Salvum fac populum tuum Domine, et benedic hereditati tuæ ; et rege eos et extolle illos usque in æternum.

Domine fiat pax in virtute tua. Et abundantia in turribus tuis.¹

Here are a few titles similar to those in the Antiphony of Bangor, and two more—*pro peccatis nostris*, and *pro pace populorum*—seem to be eloquently suggested by their appropriate versicles. Is it too great a stretch of imagination to see underlying the existing *Preces* an original form of intercession similar to those of Bangor (though probably not identical with them), from which the short Collects have been dropped and afterwards the Biddings, until the whole has been reduced to versicles—each of which is now split into a '(half-) Versicle and Response.' The oldest remaining form of the ordinary *Preces* is extant (we believe) in a monastic MS. (*v.* Martène, *De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus*, lib. i. c. 3) ; and there would be nothing intrinsically impossible in the supposition that such devotional elements as *Preces* were introduced into the (so called) secular Breviary from a monastic source—the old Roman tradition still securing their omission on Sundays and festivals.

Again, if this hypothesis should appear a probable account of the origin of the *Preces*, the Sarum Litany-form given above may perhaps throw back a reflected light upon the Bangor Intercessions, suggesting that the titles of these Intercessions—*pro Sacerdotibus*, *pro Fraternitate*, &c., are not merely titles, but biddings, pronounced by the officiant, in which case the first (which we were forced to supply conjecturally) should be read *Oremus pro peccatis nostris*.

¹ *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiæ Sarum, Fasciculus II.*—Proctor and Wordsworth (Cambridge, 1879), col. 253 sq.

We have thus endeavoured to discover the use and purpose of most of the various elements of this venerable service-book. We have not space to say anything about the Hymns, the use of which, indeed, needs hardly any elucidation. Besides the *Preces*, the book (which cannot properly be called an Antiphoner), contains a *Hymnale*, *Orationale*, *Antiphonale*—all in miniature, if we may say so. Were the meagre representations of these liturgical books intended to serve for all the year round in lieu of better? Had the monks of Bangor nothing more for their daily services in the way of a *Proprium de Tempore* and a *Proprium Sanctorum*? It seems likely enough that they would be ill provided with such, according to mediæval ideas; but the meagreness of the representatives of these in the Bangor Antiphoner is more than poverty: it is absolute destitution. Is it possible that the book was not intended for use in the monastic home, but was designed in slender proportions for use by brethren of the monastery when travelling? We cannot expect to solve the many and difficult problems suggested by this monument of Celtic piety within the limits of a Review. It will be sufficient for us if we may be able to point out something of the deep interest which clings around its venerable pages. For a thousand years it has lain unused, its chant silenced, its psalmody forgotten: it has been dumb so long that it can no longer tell us of the Divine Service of the monks of Bangor, and the famous 'Course' of Comgall and Columban. Now and again (as we bid it speak), we may catch stray glimpses of the meaning of its 'language quaint and olden,' and may venture to interpret some few of its unintelligible accents by means of remaining monuments of ages long ago. Yet the day of discovery is not past. Lost 'children of the pen' have come back to us from the earliest Christian centuries, appearing unlooked for in undreamt-of spots: can we hope that amid the wreckage of lost literature which the sea of time may cast up on the shores of the future, there may be found a second volume that shall tell us something more of the elder monasteries of the West, and of their ancient services of day and night?

ART. VI.—JUDAISM IN FICTION.

The Children of the Ghetto. By I. ZANGWILL. (London, 1892.)

The Jew. By J. I. KRASZEWSKI. Translated from the Polish by LINDA DA KOWALEWSKA. (London, 1893.)

THE image of Judaism as reflected in literature has been as varied as its reality. What figures can be more unlike than those of the Jew's daughter of the old ballad and of Rebecca in *Ivanhoe*, of Nathan the Wise and of Fagin, of Shylock and of Sidonia, of Mordecai in *Daniel Deronda*, and of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Goldsmith in the *Children of the Ghetto*? And if we come to Jews in real life, Spinoza, Heine, Lord Beaconsfield, the founder of the Rothschild family, and a crowd of others of both sexes that might be named, the characteristics of the individual are so marked that they seem at first sight to obliterate those of the race. This, however, is not the case. Just as an Irishman is always an Irishman, so (or, indeed, in a much higher degree) a Jew is always a Jew. He is greater and less than other men, with gifts above the average, a singular kind of self-respect which is compatible with acts of incredible shabbiness; of generosity and benevolence mingled with a great capacity for revengeful cruelty; above all, he is stubborn, tenacious, and in earnest (though at the same time with a light, mocking, satirical vein) to an unparalleled degree; he possesses a remarkable gift for business, side by side with peculiar susceptibility to art. His genius is unapproachably lofty, his daily dealings sometimes incredibly low. He might be called, even more truly than Lord Bacon,

'The wisest, greatest, meanest of mankind.'

Nor does it seem as if Judaism were likely to become a less important factor in society as time goes on. The Jewish race, far from showing any signs of diminishing, still seems, as it did in the days of the Pharaohs, to multiply with a fertility which the author of the Pentateuch expressed by a word suggestive of the prolific fishy tribes.¹ In the capital cities of continental Europe, as well as in London, society is in the hands of the Jews to a greater extent than its members often realize. Ample evidence of this may be found in the second work on our list, which we regret space will not allow us to notice fully, but which paints in vivid colours the important part played by Jews on the Continent, especially in Poland.

¹ Gen. xlviii. 16; Exod. i. 7.

'Already,' says one of the speakers, 'we dominate more than half of Europe in money matters, and the German press is largely at our service. France also has not escaped our influence. Warsaw is called our capital, a new Jerusalem' (p. 289). Our own age, productive as it is in unions and associations of all kinds, would find it hard to point to any artificially constructed body which has half the cohesiveness of that invisible bond which knits Jew to Jew from the highest to the lowest.¹ Such being the case, any literature which throws fresh light on the thoughts and habits of the people could not fail to be welcomed by us, even if we did not take into account the peculiar religious interest the Jews must always inspire in any sincerely Christian mind.

The 'Ghetto' to which we are introduced in M. Zangwill's pages is a dull, squalid, narrow thoroughfare in the East-end of London, connecting Spitalfields with Whitechapel, and branching off in blind alleys. Of the strange jargon talked there, the following placard, set up by a certain Baruch Emmanuel, may be a specimen. It is described as a mixture of German, bad English, and Cockneyese, phonetically spelt in Hebrew letters:—

Mens Solens Und Eelen . . .	2s. 6d.
Lydies Deeto . . .	1s. 6d.
Kindersche Deeto . . .	1s. 6d.
Hier wird gemacht	
Aller Hant Sleepers	
Fur Trebbelers	
Zu de Billigsten Preissen.	

And the language employed throughout the earlier part of the book is as tattered as the garments of any 'Schnorrer,' or beggar, to whom the author introduces us—here a patch of German, there a shred of Hebrew—the latter language often as ungrammatically used as the 'thou' and 'thee' of Quakers among ourselves.

The Jew as depicted in the *Children of the Ghetto* differs as markedly from the Jew in *Daniel Deronda* as George Eliot's own early creations, her Mrs. Poysers and Maggie Tullivers, her Dodsons and Gleggs differ from Romola. In the one case we have a view from within, in the other from without. As brilliant *tours de force* we admire both *Daniel Deronda* and *Romola*, but there is a certain raciness which no reading or

¹ In the September of 1893 the celebration of the New Year's Festival, 1st of Tishri, was held in the Great Assembly Hall, Mile End Road, which was thronged by the Jews of the 'East-end.' About 5,500 persons were admitted, and nearly as many more were turned away.

intentional observation can give, and there are little touches in Mr. Zangwill's work which seem to indicate an intimate knowledge of his subject at a period when the author's literary faculty had hardly become conscious of itself. Here, for instance, is a Dickens-like picture of a 'sharp boy,' who rejoices in the name of Solomon (i. 142).

'In the direst need of the Ansell, Solomon held his curly head high among his schoolfellows, and never lacked personal possessions, though they were not negotiable at the pawnbroker's. He had a peep-show, made out of an old cocoa-box, and representing the sortie from Plevna, a permit to view being obtainable for a fragment of slate pencil. For two pence he would let you look a whole minute. He also had bags of brass buttons, marbles, both commoners and alleys, nibs, beer-bottle labels, and cherry "hogs," besides bottles of liquorice water, vendible by the sip or the teaspoonful; and he dealt in "assy-tassy," which consisted of little packets of acetic acid blent with brown sugar. The character of his stock varied according to the time of year, for Nature and Belgravia are less stable in their seasons than the Jewish schoolboy, to whom buttons in March are as inconceivable as snowballing in July.

'On Purim Solomon always had nuts to gamble with, just as if he had been a banker's son, and on the Day of Atonement he was never without a little tin fusee box filled with savings of snuff. This, when the fast racked them most sorely, he would pass round among the old men with a grand manner. They would take a pinch and say, "May thy strength increase," and blow their delighted noses with great coloured handkerchiefs, and Solomon would feel about fifty, and sniff a few grains himself with the air of an aged connoisseur.'

The work before us teems with passages like this; it is, in fact, rather a collection of wonderfully lifelike sketches, than remarkable for strength and interest of plot. But we have never met with a book which more fearlessly paints the Jew as he *is* in his many-sided character, with its tenacity and its versatility, its piety and its irreverence, its pride and its servility, its wit and wealth of imagery and its matter-of-factness, its love of race and its *adopted* national prejudices, its greed and its generosity, its scrupulous cleanliness and its greasy dirtiness, its literalism and its superstition.

A curious illustration of Jewish Sabbatarianism, run very hard by Jewish love of stockbroking, is given in the second volume, p. 29.

'Over the Sabbath meal the current of talk divided itself into masculine and feminine freshets. The ladies discussed bonnets, and the gentlemen Talmud. All the three men dabbled, pettily enough, in stocks and shares, but nothing in the world would tempt them . . . to discuss the merits of a prospectus on the Sabbath, though they were all fluttered by the allurements of the Sapphire Mines,

Limited, as set forth in a whole page of advertisement in the *Jewish Chronicle*.¹

After some Talmudic discussion of Moses striking the rock :

"Yes," said Sugarman, the Shadchan [or marriage agent], quickly, "but if his rod had been made of sapphire he would have split that instead of the rock. . . . But we are not all strong enough to wield Moses' rod ; it weighs forty seahs."

"How many seahs do you think one could carry safely ?" asked Meckish. [The reader will see here that 'seahs' is a cant term for shares in the new undertaking.]

"Five or six seahs, not more," said Sugarman. "You see, one might drop them if he attempted more, and even sapphire may break. The first Tables of the Law were made of sapphire, and yet from a great height they fell terribly, and were shattered to pieces."

"Gideon, the M.P., may be said to desire a rod of Moses, for his secretary told me he will take forty," said Shmendrik.

"Hush ! what are you saying ?" cried Sugarman. "Gideon is a rich man ; and then, he is a director."

"It seems a good lot of directors," said Meckish.

"Good to look at. But who can tell ?" said Sugarman, shaking his head. "The Queen of Sheba probably brought sapphires to Solomon, but she was not a virtuous woman."

Sugarman, as we have already mentioned, is an official who arranges marriages, and the love-making conducted under his auspices gives rise to some of the most humorous scenes in the book, which, we regret, we have not space to insert.

We may compare with our previous extract the following description of Reb Shemuel's Sabbath (ii. 78) :—

"The work of the week was over. The faithful Jew could enter on his rest ; the narrow, miry streets faded before the brighter image of his brain. "Come, my beloved, to meet the Bride ; the face of the Sabbath let us welcome."

"To-night his sweetheart would wear her Sabbath face, putting off the mask of the shrew, which hid, not from him, the angel countenance. To-night he could in very truth call his wife (as the Rabbi in the Talmud did) "not wife, but home." To-night she would be in very truth *Simcha*—"rejoicing" . . . As he approached the door cheerful lights gleamed on him like a heavenly smile. . . . The Reb kissed the *Mezuzah*¹ on the outside of the door, and his daughter, who met him, on the inside. Everything was as he had pictured it : the two tall wax candles in quaint, heavy silver candlesticks, the spotless tablecloth, the dish of fried fish made picturesque with sprigs of parsley, the Sabbath loaves shaped like boys' tipcats—with a

¹ A case or cylinder containing sacred writing with the word *Shaddai* (Almighty) peering out of a little glass eye in the centre.

curious plait of crust from point to point, and thickly sprinkled with a drift of poppy-seed, and covered with a velvet cloth embroidered with Hebrew words—the flask of wine and the silver goblet. The sight was familiar, yet it always struck the simple old Reb anew with a sense of special blessing,¹ &c.¹

The charming picture of domestic life which follows this may again be contrasted with the chapter on the 'Sons of the Covenant' (i. 264)—the very Puritans of Judaism. Among these the figure of Karlkammer stands out, reminding us somewhat of a page from *Old Mortality* :—

'Karlkammer was one of the curiosities of the Ghetto. In a land of *froom* (pious=*fromm*) men, he was the *froomest*. He had the very genius of fanaticism. On the Sabbath he spoke nothing but Hebrew, whatever the inconvenience and however numerous the misunderstandings, and if he perchance paid a visit, he would not perform the "work" of lifting the knocker. . . . One of the walls of his room had an unpapered and unpainted scrap in mourning for the fall of Jerusalem. He walked through the streets to synagogue attired in his praying-shawl and phylacteries, and knocked three times at the door of God's house when he arrived. On the Day of Atonement he walked in his socks, though the heavens fell, wearing his grave-clothes. On this day he remained standing in synagogue from 6 A.M. to 7 P.M. with his body bent at an angle of ninety degrees. It was to give him bending space that he hired two seats. On Tabernacles, not having any ground whereon to erect a booth, by reason of living in an attic, he knocked a square hole in the ceiling, covered it with branches, through which the free air of heaven played, and hung a quadrangle of sheets from roof to floor. He bore to synagogue the tallest *Lulav* of palm-branches that could be procured, and quarrelled with a rival pietist for the last place in the floral procession, as being the lowliest and meekest man in Israel. . . . He insisted on bearing a corner of the biers of all the righteous dead. Almost every other day was a fast-day for Karlkammer, and he had a host of supplementary ceremonial observances which are not for the vulgar. . . . He was a man of prodigious distorted mental activity. . . . His letters to the press on specifically Jewish subjects were the most hopeless, involved, incomprehensible, and protracted puzzles ever penned. . . . They were written in good English . . . in a beautiful hand with the t's uncrossed, but crowned with the side-stroke, so as to avoid the appearance of the symbol of Christianity, and with the dates expressed according to the Hebrew calendar.'

From this picture of the 'extreme right' we turn to a picture of the 'extreme left,' which the second part of the book gives us under the title of 'The Grandchildren of the

¹ For another admirable description of the Sabbath-keeping of a Jew of the old school, we may refer our readers to M. Kraszewski's book, p. 158.

Ghetto.' We follow the fortunes of the heroine, Esther Ansell, a clever Jewish girl who has risen from poverty by the exertion of her abilities, first as a school teacher, and afterwards as the author (under the *nom de plume* of Edward Armitage) of a novel of Jewish life. Of her early development we are told (i. 192):—

'Esther led a double life, just as she spoke two tongues. The knowledge that she was a Jewish child, whose people had a special history, was always at the back of her consciousness. . . . But far more vividly did she realize that she was an English girl; far keener than her pride in Judas Maccabæus was her pride in Nelson and Wellington; she rejoiced to find that her ancestors had always beaten the French, . . . that Alfred the Great was the wisest of kings, and that Englishmen dominated the world, &c. &c. . . . Esther absorbed these ideas from the school reading-books. The experience of a month will overlay the hereditary bequest of a century. And yet, beneath all, the prepared plate remains most sensitive to the old impressions.'

Esther becomes a *protégée* of Mrs. Henry Goldsmith, one of the wealthy upper middle class, whose husband owns a handsome house at Kensington, gives smart dinners to a circle of Jews who, as far as possible, have Anglicized themselves, and 'gone in' for art culture and modern thought. Many of them have changed their names—Abrahams into Graham, Samuels into Savile, &c. Mrs. Goldsmith gives a Christmas dinner like the rest of the world, but professes it is in honour of 'the feast of Chanukah'—of the re-dedication of the Temple after the pollutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the memory of Judas Maccabæus!

An amusing figure is that of Mary O'Reilly, the old servant who has followed the rising fortunes of the family, and who—herself a Roman Catholic—is 'more Jewish than the Jews' in her knowledge of and insistence upon the recognized observances (ii. 241), which, now that the Goldsmiths have moved into more fashionable quarters with the hope of emancipating themselves to some extent from traditional bondage, they are hardly so grateful to her for as they ought to be.

'Mary knew exactly how long to keep the meat in salt, and the heinousness of frying steaks in butter. She knew that the fire must not be poked on the Sabbath, nor the gas lit or extinguished, and that her master must not smoke till three stars appeared in the sky. She knew when the family must fast, and when and how it must feast. . . . Too late the Henry Goldsmiths awoke to the consciousness of her tyranny, which did not permit them to be irreligious even

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. LXXIV.

B B

in private. . . . There was a little milk-jug on the coffee-tray. It represented a victory over Mary O'Reilly. The late Aaron Goldsmith never took milk till six hours after meat, and it was with some trepidation that the present Mr. Goldsmith ordered it to be sent up one evening after dinner. He took an early opportunity of explaining apologetically to Mary that some of his guests were not so pious as himself, and hospitality demanded the concession. Mr. Henry Goldsmith did not like his coffee black. His dinner-table was hardly ever without a guest' (p. 27).

It is in this luxurious house that the young lady novelist finds herself, surrounded by a fashionable society, who fall to criticizing her book at a dinner-party without the smallest idea that they are in the presence of the author. Esther has seen the darker, drearier, and narrower side of Judaism, as well as the weaknesses and follies of the more prosperous and better educated, and her book has given full and unsparing expression to her thoughts. It is while smarting under the lash of dinner-table criticism that she makes the acquaintance of Raphael Leon, a rich young Jew of good family, who has had an Oxford education, but who still clings to and idealizes his old faith and nationality. Filled with enthusiasm for the past of Judaism, he believes devoutly in its future.

'Our mission,' he says (p. 268), 'is to spread the truth of the Torah till the earth is filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. . . . Christianity and Mohammedanism are offshoots of Judaism; through them we have won the world from paganism, and taught it that God is one with the moral law.'

Raphael undertakes the editorship of the *Flag of Judah*, an up-to-date orthodox paper, and his editorial woes are very good reading, especially his difficulties with the Hebrew poet Pinchas, whose enthusiastic self-satisfaction is most amusingly described. We recognize in the name Pinchas our old friend Phinehas, and it is certainly most appropriate to this 'brazen-mouthed' gentleman.

Naturally, the *Flag of Judah* collapses, or, rather, Raphael withdraws from the editorship, as he cannot satisfy his supporters, his ideals being quite untranslatable into the language of modern 'respectable' Judaism; and the close of his editorial career is marked by the recantation of Strelitzki, the fashionable minister of a synagogue frequented by Jews 'in society.' Strelitzki tears off his clerical white tie in Raphael's office, and exclaims:—

'Leon, listen to me. . . . Do you realize what sort of a position you are asking me to keep? Do you realize how it makes me the fief of a Rabbinate, that is, an anachronism, the bondman of out-

worn forms, . . . the professional panegyrist of the rich? Ours is a generation of whitened sepulchres. . . . How can Judaism, and it alone, . . . escape going through the fire of modern scepticism, from which, if religion emerge at all, it will emerge without its dross? Are not we Jews always the first prey of new ideas, with our alert intellect, our swift receptiveness, our keen critical sense . . .? Indifference and hypocrisy between them keep religion alive, while they kill Judaism.'

After some remarks from Raphael he continues—

'The Rabbis worked for their time; we must work for ours. Judaism was before the Rabbis. Scientific criticism shows its thoughts widening with the process of the suns, even as its God, Yahveh, broadened from a local patriotic Deity to the Ineffable Name. For Judaism was worked out from within. Abraham asked, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The thunders of Sinai were but the righteous indignation of the developed moral consciousness. In every age our great men have modified and developed Judaism. Why should it not be trimmed into concordance with the culture of the time? Especially when the alternative is death?' (iii. 270).

As we close the book, which ends with the engagement of Raphael and Esther, and her departure for a temporary sojourn in America, where she considers the 'future' of Judaism in all probability lies, we lay it down with the same kind of suspicion at the bottom of our hearts that the young couple will find disenchantment and disappointment awaiting them which most of us must have felt when Deronda and Mirah take their passage for Palestine. The 'future' of Judaism seems to recede further and further into the distance the more we press towards it. Restoration to the literal 'Holy Land' for the large portion of a race which has multiplied at the rate which the Jewish race has done would seem as chimerical as it would be to find space in the England of to-day for all the descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers and other settlers of British blood now in the United States.

It is not, we may be sure, without a deep inner meaning that the grand scale on which the mystic Temple, so minutely described by the Prophet Ezekiel, is planned, would make it physically impossible to erect it on the ancient site.

As far as we can judge, however, the author's own sympathies are with those who believe in the mission of Judaism, spiritualized but not disembodied, to regenerate modern society. 'In spirit,' Raphael is made to say (iii. 165), 'orthodox Judaism is undoubtedly akin to Socialism.' Again (p. 273), Strelitzki says:—

'The world is longing for a broad simple faith that shall look on

science as its friend and reason as its inspirer. People are turning in their despair even to table-rappings and Mahatmas. Now, for the first time in history, is the hour of Judaism. Only it must enlarge itself; its platform must be all-inclusive. Judaism is but a specialized form of Hebraism; even if Jews stick to their own special historical and ritual ceremonies, it is only Hebraism—the pure spiritual kernel—that they can offer the world. . . . The formula of the religion of the future will be a Jewish formula—Character, not Creed.'

The question at once arises, Why, when even the more enlightened among the Jews acknowledge that 'the letter killeth,' that the days are gone by for minute and (under the circumstances) ludicrous observances, absurd Talmudic legends, and local sanctities—when they themselves are looking for the inner and spiritual life which alone can prevent their religion from losing all claims on the veneration of thinking men—why do they still ignore the claims of One Who, for nearly two thousand years, has been proclaiming to them this very truth, and pointing out to them the very way to live up to it? How is it that Jesus Christ is still hidden from them? To some extent this is due to the fact that now, as in our Lord's days, and more than in our Lord's days, Holy Scripture is concealed from the Jew beneath a thick crust of tradition. The comment has crowded out the text. The Jew becomes acquainted with his Bible, if at all, in the vernacular of our Authorized Version. But we fear the answer is, in part at least, because Christians are still so apt to Judaize. The author of this book himself speaks (iii. 275) of the 'many Christian clergymen who are silently bringing Christianity back to Judaism.' What, for instance, are the accretions with which the Church of Rome is for ever loading Evangelical truth but a process precisely similar to that which has gone on before and since the Christian era in the Jewish Church? Apocryphal legends, 'pious opinions,' usages which, once flexible, are now stereotyped and unchangeable; scruples of conscience about unimportant matters, a 'making the Word of God of none effect through tradition'; exaggerated asceticism on the one hand, thinly veiled worldliness on the other—all these things may be found among Christians as well as Jews. Would that they were confined to one branch of the Catholic Church!

On the other hand, a cold grey Protestantism or a barren Rationalism can never meet the difficulty. While the Jew has an unconquerable horror of idolatry, we must not forget that he instinctively thinks in imagery, and that a religion devoid of externals is utterly foreign to his nature. He is a

poet, a musician, and, as these pages tell us, if not a dramatist, yet a lover of the drama, and with great histrionic powers. He has a mind predisposed for sacraments and symbols. Nor can he exist upon dreary negations.

'Probably from the terrible inroad made into orthodox Judaism by Deism,' says a recent article in the *Spectator*, 'Adolph Saphir [the well-known Hungarian Jewish preacher] had a perfect horror of what is called "the Broad Church," and intensely disliked all attempts to explain away, or "rationalize," the miraculous element in the Scriptures:—

'I suffered,' he says, 'for years from the teaching of Schleiermacher's disciples (when I was about seventeen). These men were just like the Broad Church people. They are strong in *negatives*,—no vicarious Atonement, *no* real Inspiration of Scripture, *no* Conversion by the Holy Ghost, *no* assurance of Salvation; everything is simply modifying, analysing, diluting, and undermining the doctrine and experience of the Christian Church. . . . I am reading just now Jowett's new book on Paul. I like the style, but not the matter. He has no idea of the Divinity of the Old Testament and its dispensations, and sees therefore many *Jewish* views in Paul.'

We think, too, that our author has hit a real blot in so-called Christianity when he speaks of it (ii. 280) as 'pessimistic,' and describes in contrast the ideal Jewish view of human life 'as a holy and precious gift, to be enjoyed heartily, yet spent in God's service—birth, marriage, death, all holy; good, evil, alike holy. Nothing on God's earth common or purposeless,' &c.

No doubt the Manicheanism which is to be found in different forms, alike in Popery and Puritanism, is a real perversion of Christianity, a mischievous ignoring of the truths taught in that first miracle at Cana in Galilee, and insisted upon by St. Paul in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. The whole doctrine of the Incarnation seems to have been warped or entirely misunderstood by such schools of theology as these, and we of the present day have much cause to be thankful that, side by side with the progress of art and natural science, our theological teaching has come more and more to insist, not only on the sacredness of the human body as worn by Christ, but on the sacredness of the whole earthly creation, amidst which—His own work at the beginning—He lived and moved, and whence He drew His material alike for parables and miracles for three and thirty years.

On the other hand, when Raphael adds:—

'There is no devil, no original sin, no need of salvation from it, no need of a mediator. Every Jew is in as direct a relation with

God as the Chief Rabbi. Christianity is an historical failure, its counsels of perfection, its command to turn the other cheek, a farce. When a modern spiritual genius, a Tolstoi, repeats it, all Christendom laughs, as at a new freak of insanity ;'

Esther very properly replies that

'Christianity is not to be charged with its historical caricatures, nor with its superiority to average human nature. As for the doctrine of original sin, it is the one thing that the science of heresy has demonstrated . . . with a difference. But do not be alarmed ; I do not call myself a Christian because I see some relation between the dogmas of Christianity and the truths of experience—nor even because' (here she smiled wistfully) 'I should like to believe in Jesus' (ii. 283).

The novel does not end with Esther's conversion. We could wish for her sake it had done so, for throughout this book we feel that the gains of Jewish women in embracing Christianity are even more than those of their brethren, each of whom is taught to thank God habitually that he was not born a woman.

We leave the betrothed pair with no very definite future before them, as with no very definite creed. And when all is said, we come back to the old position that religion must have not only a history behind it, as well as a future before it, but also certain external forms embodying it. There is something very pathetic in the way Judaism tries to perform the impossible, to hold a Feast of Tabernacles in the dirtiest and most crowded part of London, and to carry out the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement, when no sacrifice can be offered, when high priest and temple and altar have alike vanished. Where *is* the atonement? If it is impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats can take away sin, it is no less impossible that any man can take away his own or his brother's. 'It cost more to redeem their souls.'

But if the old ceremonial of the Law has become in many cases impracticable, it does not follow either that the ideas expressed by it are obsolete, or that those ideas are incapable of being embodied in forms which are—like the Christian Sacraments—of such a kind that they can be universally observed ; and it is not the least among the *à priori* arguments in favour of Christianity that, while encumbered with no rites that are difficult of transplantation from one country to another, it has a certain outward symbolism based on things which are held in common by men in all ages and nearly every clime.

Why, may we ask, has Judaism been preserved? Why is it that, up to this day, a race with such marked characteristics, such fine physical and mental qualities, such fertility and productiveness, should still co-exist like oil in water, amidst, but not of, the civilized races of Europe and America, to say nothing of other portions of the globe?

First, no doubt, to bear witness to the literal historical truth of the Old Testament. It is possible, perhaps, to 'explain away' a literature, but you cannot 'explain away' the deep-seated customs of a race. Some prodigious force must have been at work—some great impact must have been given by a hand of supernatural power to have left on one day in seven for countless generations an indelible impression like that of the Jewish Sabbath. We go back without a break, from our own contemporaries, the inhabitants of the dirty purlieus of Whitechapel, to human life at a period long anterior to the Mosaic law.

So with the Passover. We may judge of the momentum of the original force by the permanence of its effects. What has become of the Panathenaic Festival, the Eleusinian Mysteries, the Olympic Games, and all the endless sacred days and national festivals of the Roman Fasti? What was there in the hand laid upon the Jews at the Exodus which goes thrilling down the ages with an undying vibration? It is true that there are countries still, like India and China, where ancient rites are preserved and perhaps still vigorous; but the cases are not parallel. In the latter the race has gone on in its old home undisturbed and uninterrupted; in the former it has been preserved intact—as no other race has ever been—amidst surroundings sometimes hostile, usually unfriendly, sometimes perhaps enervating, always unfavourable; and yet

Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumque ferro.

Again, the *Yom Kippur*, the Day of Atonement, so often mentioned in these pages, shorn as it is of its old solemnities, bears witness to the deeply rooted sense of sin, the longing for a Mediator, which lies at the very core of the life of the most remarkable nation the world has ever seen. All these things are of enormous value in an age like ours. It is testimony not hidden in a library, but alive and speaking and moving, something to be seen and heard. The very hatred inspired by the Jews in some countries shows that, whatever else they may be, they cannot be ignored or treated as of no account. If ever the Invisible has touched the visible, if ever the

spiritual has allied itself with the material, it has been among the sons of Israel.

But we may not pause here. No one can familiarize himself with modern Jewish life without recalling at every turn the circumstances which the Gospels have made familiar to us. To Western readers it may perhaps seem strange that so large a portion of documents in every way so precious should be taken up with rebukes to Scribes and Pharisees and Lawyers, indignant protests at the dull, stupid narrowness of view which 'made the Word of God of none effect'; but if we once recognize the importance of the Old Testament, the part played by it in the history of human thought and conviction, the inestimable treasures which Judaism had in its keeping, the inner meaning which lay beneath those rites so perversely misunderstood, we shall not feel that our Lord's language was too strong, or His warnings too often reiterated. The Jews had a mission such as no other race has ever had; to be faithless to such a mission, to be 'fools, and slow of heart,' as they were, was not only an intellectual fault, but among the gravest of moral offences; a wilful blindness for which no excuse was sufficient; a rebellion against their Maker for which inevitable retribution must ensue.

In reflecting on the ideal Jewish character, that ideal which, never wholly realized, yet has never quite been lost sight of—a character so gifted and so graced, so strong in its appreciation of and mastery over the things of this life, and yet wonderful and unapproachable in its intuitions of another—we feel how natural the transition is which Isaiah (for instance) makes between 'Israel My servant' and the Messiah Himself.

Jesus Christ is to Judaism what Judaism is, or ought to be, to humanity—the point of contact, the Mediator between God and men. He is, in a stronger sense even than St. Paul, 'a Hebrew of the Hebrews.' Alas for ourselves if we by a blind, dull literalism misunderstand Him and maim His teaching, as the Jews did that of the Law and the Prophets which testified of Him, or if we despise and rebel against and resist Him as the Jews of Palestine did in His own day! For we may be sure that it is as true now as it ever was 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken, but upon whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.'

ART. VII.—THEODULF OF ORLEANS.

Theodulfe Evêque d'Orléans : sa Vie et ses Œuvres. Avec une Carte du Pagus Aurelianensis au IX^e Siècle. Par CH. CUISSARD, Sous-Bibliothécaire de la Ville d'Orléans. (Orléans, 1892.)

THE reputation of Theodulf has been overshadowed by the fame of Alcuin, his great contemporary. We are proud of the latter as a fellow-countryman. Even the small Primer of English Literature will tell how 'Alcuin, a pupil of Egbert, Archbishop of York, carried in 782 to the court of Charles the Great the learning and piety of England.' But though Theodulf is unknown to English readers, except through the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, his character deserves a more popular record, and his work as a bishop, earnest and thorough in word and deed, had a lasting influence.

Alcuin had a high opinion of his powers, and classed him among 'our doctors and masters' in a letter to the King. And the fact that Theodulf's treatises on Adoptianism, Baptism, and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit were published by request of other bishops to meet special emergencies, is a tribute to his theological learning. His Capitularies, or Episcopal Charges, which took the form of a series of summary instructions to the clergy, were reproduced in the dioceses of Meaux and Bourges, and among the decrees of various synods.¹

M. Cuissard's monograph, which throws much fresh light on his life and works, does him no more than justice as a reformer and a theologian, though one cannot help feeling that in certain details M. Cuissard carries hero-worship too far. The book is included among the publications of the Historical and Archæological Society of Orléans, which is to be congratulated on the fruits of the encouragement thus given to historical research. The author, with a touch of humour, referring to the researches, 'parfois indigestes,' of German writers, has been at great pains to make his own work complete, according to the Horatian maxim, *in se ipso totus, teres atque rotundus*.

So he begins with a study of the topography of the diocese, giving an interesting map of the Pagus Aurelianensis. And he includes in his survey of Theodulf's life and times, equally comprehensive chapters on the general state of society (p. 197), the constitution of the churches (p. 221), the cha-

¹ M. Cuissard adds : 'also among the decrees of an English Council.'

racter of the instruction given in the schools (p. 246), religious and liturgical usages (p. 263), and even extends his investigations to the dress and trade (p. 311) of the district. The last detail in the table of contents sounds amusingly irrelevant in the life of a bishop, 'the wines of Orléans.' But the insertion of this heading is justified by reference to a playful letter of Alcuin to Theodulf, in which he asks that illustrious pontiff and father of the vines to let the overseer give up the keys of the cellar and send Alcuin's monks of Tours some more of their famous wine. Alcuin compares his friend to Zabdi, 'who was over the increase of the vineyards of David.' This was an allusion to the custom at the court of Charles of calling the members of the King's inner circle by various pseudonyms. The King was David, Alcuin was Flaccus, Angilbert Homer. But we cannot argue from this letter that Zabdi was Theodulf's usual nickname, nor that he was overseer of the royal vineyards.¹ The name seems to have been coined for this occasion only. He was not long at court, nor was he a member of the School of the Palace. 'It is not necessary,' observes M. Cuissard (p. 325), 'to search so far for an explanation.' It is simply a proof that the wines of Orleans were as famous in the ninth century as in later times, when they were celebrated in prose and poetry.

Much uncertainty has hitherto prevailed on the question of Theodulf's nationality. The epitaphs written for him leave it doubtful whether he was an Ostrogoth from Italy, or a Visigoth from Spain:

'Non noster genitus, noster habeatur alumnus :
Protulit hunc Speria, Gallia sed nutrit.'

And,

'Hesperia genitus, hac sum tellure sepultus.'

The name Hesperia, or Speria, was used both for Italy and Spain. But the *Chronicle of Fleury*, which reproduces the statement of an old catalogue of the abbots, substitutes Italia, showing how the word was understood in later times. Moreover, the fact that he was involved with two Italian bishops in the revolt of Bernard of Italy seemed to make it probable that he was suspected because of his Italian extraction.

¹ Herr Rzehulka; Rev. A. H. Wilson; art. 'Theodulf' in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* Professor West, in his new book on *Alcuin* (Heinemann, 1893), maintains another view, and without a reference gives Pindar as Theodulf's nickname, and even argues into this letter recondite references to the supposed succession of Theodulf to Alcuin's position as Minister of Education, 'injunctions to Theodulf to promote the study of the old seven liberal arts without any admixture of new notions, in that the old wine is better than the new.'

However, M. Cuissard (p. 45) brings forward some new arguments which turn the scale of evidence. He shows that Alcuin and Prudentius used the word *Hesperia* to mean Spain. The latter even describes his own Spanish birth in the very phrase used of Theodulf, '*Hesperia genitus*.' Theodulf, in a birthday poem¹ for the king, names the peoples of Africa, Gaul, Italy, and *Hesperia*, which is clearly Spain. And he writes with enthusiasm of the beauties of Spain—the garden of the *Hesperides*, the *Asturias*, and *Galicia* and *Cordova*. Such geographical references are rare in contemporary writings, and show an intimate knowledge of the country. He claims Prudentius as a fellow-countryman, '*noster et ipse parens*.'² This might refer to literary debts, but Virgil and Ovid were his chief models. The wide range of his classical education makes possible the further inference that he was brought up at a Spanish school, possibly at *Cordova*.³

The schools of Aquitaine were under a cloud. In 782 Adhemar de Chabannes wrote that the whole world was illiterate. The once flourishing school of Toulouse maintained only a shadow of its former greatness. But on the other side of the Pyrenees, under the protection of the Arab Caliph, Abd-el-Rhaman, arts and sciences flourished. Christians who submitted to his rule were allowed full liberty of worship in their own churches. Schools were founded everywhere, and a great impulse was given to industry of all kinds. The Arabs had been brought by their conquests into contact with the civilization of the old world, and the Spanish Christians were through them made acquainted with the masters of ancient learning, Euclid, Galen, Aristotle. No doubt, since some literary treasures were preserved in monastic libraries from the fifth to the tenth centuries, it was not only to the Moors that Europe owes its introduction to them. Egbert's library at York contained the works of Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Aristotle.⁴ But in Spain their dominion gave a great impetus to culture and classical studies, and Theodulf's own references to classical authors make it probable that he was educated in some Spanish school. Among 'wise heathen,' whom he had read, he classed Donatus, Virgil, Ovid, and

¹ *Carm.* vi. 709; cf. 755.

² *Ibid.* iv. 16.

³ M. Cuissard's suggestion that he was born at Saragossa has little support.

⁴ Cf. *Ven. Bedæ Hist.*, Mayor and Lumby, p. 299 n.; and Guizot, *Hist. Civilization in France*, ii. 232 (trans.).

upheld¹ vigorously the advantage to the mind of searching for the treasures of truth hidden under much that was false teaching. Of Theodulf's family we know little or nothing. Tradition calls them noble. A poem addressed to his daughter Gisla on her marriage with Sauericus has been variously interpreted. The tone is more natural and tender than that in which Alcuin writes to his spiritual daughter Eugenia. But in the absence of all other proof it would be rash to assume that he had been married in early life, as M. Cuissard is inclined to believe. The following lines are a good specimen of his lighter style, and they show quite a modern feeling of woman's place in the home :

'Sit tibi larga manus, mores compti, actio prudens,
Unde Creatori rite placere queas.
Sit lanæ studium, sit cura domestica semper,
Mens tua quo famulos mulceat atque virum.'

His wedding gift was a magnificent Psalter, resplendent with silver and gold, which he begged her to study.

'Assidue si ores, tibi sit si lectio crebra,
Ipsa Deo loqueris, et Deus ipse tibi.'

The first certain date of his life is the year 774, when he came to the monastery of Lorsch, near Heidelberg, to assist at the reception of some relics of St. Nazaire in a new church. Snow was falling, and Theodulf recorded the fact in some verses written as an inscription for the saint's tomb. Probably he had been exiled from his native country, as he writes of the king :

'Annuis is mihi qui sum immensis casibus exul.'

The king returned from Italy in 781, about which time we find Theodulf at court. We must therefore conclude, with the older historians, that, like Alcuin, he had travelled into Italy, and that they returned together in the king's suite.

Attracted by the young foreigner's bold words on the need of reform, Charles made him bishop of Orleans. The direction of his thoughts is shown in the poem, *Parænesis ad Episcopos*, whether this was written before or after his consecration. M. Cuissard supposes that he spoke as one young in office with the added timidity of a foreigner.² The date

¹ Carm. iv. 19 :

'In quorum dictis, quamquam sint frivola multa,
Plurima sub falso tegmine vera latent.'

² P. 62 ; Carm. v. 452 :

'Parva sed in magna cum sim Levitide turba
Pars, placet ut patres qua queo sorte juvem.'

of his consecration cannot be fixed with any certainty. An old chronicle¹ shows that the infant prince, Louis, was brought into Orleans with great pomp in 782, and, since no mention is made of Theodulf, we may fairly conclude, with M. Cuissard, that he was not yet bishop. It is quite certain, however, that he was not elected abbot of Fleury till 800. An old list of the abbots² preserved at Berne, which states how long each abbot held his office, has enabled M. Cuissard to calculate this date from the year of the foundation of the monastery, 643. The fact was that, as bishop, he entered into relations with all the monasteries of his diocese as abbot beneficiary, or, as we should say, 'Visitor.' In this capacity he interested himself in their schools and in their organization.³ The Abbey of St. Anianus, founded by the founder of Fleury, had been for some time under the double rule of St. Columban and St. Benedict, but the monks preferred to change their rule, and became canons.

Hitherto the abbey had not been of much importance, but under Theodulf's patronage their church was restored and endowed by the king with new estates. Louis the Pious also granted them two charters in favour of Theodulf, who is thus shown to have kept up his interest in their affairs. The restoration of the Abbey of Micy at the meeting of the Loiret with the river Loire, was a more difficult task. Like other monasteries which had not adopted the rule of St. Benedict, discipline had grown lax. 'Love of the world,' says an old chronicler, 'and covetousness, the mother of all evils,' had wrecked their piety, and the very buildings fell into ruins. During a disastrous civil war between Pepin and Waiffre, the Duke of Aquitaine, the abbots appeared on the field at the head of their vassals and fought for their possessions. Glutted with success they abandoned themselves to feasting, till the whole building became a resort for bad characters and a stable of cattle. The bishop applied to Benedict of St. Anianus, the Wesley of the age, to help him in his task. Benedict accordingly sent him two monks. It is interesting to note that Benedict was of the same Gothic race. They may have met at the court; at all events they appear to have been personal friends, and in a poem sent off on the arrival of the monks, Theodulf But Theodulf himself (Carm. iii. 175) uses the term of 'Fredegisus Diaconus,' and it was used by Alcuin of his office as deacon.

¹ Bouquet, vi. 89.

² Written apparently at Fleury in the ninth century, Theodulf being the last.

³ In cap. 19 he refers to the monasteries: Cœnobia, quæ nobis ad regendum concessa sunt, i.e. St. Anianus, St. Benedict, St. Liphard.

seeks mystical meanings for the number 2 to express his thanks, and his confidence in their aptitude for their task.

'It represents,' he says, 'love of God and of our neighbour, or the active and contemplative ideals of life.' Benedict afterwards sent twelve other monks, under the leadership of Dreutesinda, who became their abbot, and, when the work was completed, accepted Theodulf's invitation to pay them a visit.

About 791 Alcuin advised the king to call in the aid of Paulinus, archbishop of Aquileia, Rigbod, archbishop of Trèves, and Theodulf, to prepare a collective reply to the treatise of the Adoptianist bishop, Felix. It is not known for certain what answer Theodulf made, but some fragments of a work on Adoptianism, recently discovered by M. Cuissard (Orléans MS. 94), appear to be part of his treatise on the subject. He took part in the discussion at the Council of Frankfort which crushed the heresy; and if, as we suppose, he was himself of Spanish birth, we have a special reason why his help was sought. Returning to his diocese, he was, in 798, appointed, with Leidrad, archbishop of Lyons, on a commission (as *missi dominici*) to inquire into the condition of the two districts of Narbonne. Having received his instructions at Aix-la-Chapelle, he joined his colleague at Lyons, and they started on their journey. In one of his poems he has given a graphic record of his impressions, and a vivid picture of the social life of the time. A large crowd pressed round them offering them bribes.

'Oh wicked pest spread over all places . . . nowhere is there wanting people who give and people who receive wrongfully. They hastened to gain me; and they would not have thought me susceptible of corruption if they had not found my predecessors susceptible. No one seeks wild boars in the water, fish in the forest, water in fire. . . . But in order not to show myself deficient in moderation and discreet judgment, to manifest that I had acted openly and frankly, to guard against my conduct exciting too much astonishment by its entire novelty, and that the so recent evil might not bring good into hatred, I did not refuse that which was offered me by real benevolence, by that noble feeling which, joining souls together, causes them readily to take and receive from each other. I accepted with thanks the little presents made me, not by the hand of anger, but by that of friendship, fruit, vegetables, eggs, wine, bread, hay.'¹

In the spring of the year 800 the king came in state to Orleans, and was received with great demonstrations of loyalty.² The school of music presided over by Theodulf, at

¹ *Parænesis ad Judices*, Carm. i.

² Carm. vi. 749.

St. Cross, assembled all its pupils to sing his praises, and the monks of St. Anianus were not behindhand in their recognition of his generosity. Charles had tried to introduce the Roman style of chanting, and had established schools¹ of music at Metz, Lyons, and Orleans, the latter of which maintained its reputation throughout the Middle Ages. On Christmas Day of this year Charles was crowned Emperor, an event which Theodulf commemorated in joyful strains;² but he protested strongly against the division of the kingdom which the emperor planned some five years later in hope of preserving peace in his scattered dominions. He was at heart a thorough Unionist, and saw in the ancient fable of Geryon, the giant with three heads, a true symbol of a united empire. Moreover, he was an admirer of the emperor's eldest son Charles, who was expected to succeed to the imperial throne. But Charles died in 811, and Theodulf's fortunes seemed to sink from that day.

During these years he wrote books on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost and on the order of Baptism. The doctrine of the Double Procession had been discussed years before at the Council of Gentilly (767), but it was now brought into prominence by the action of the monks of Mount Olivet, who appealed both to the Pope and to the emperor for authority to use the Filioque clause. The subject was discussed again by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (809), and it was decided to allow the clause and to send an embassy to the Pope. Among others Theodulf was asked to write on the subject, and produced a treatise which was, for the time, a monument of learning.

In 811 the emperor raised the question of the proper ceremonies of Baptism in a circular letter to the archbishops, one of whom, Magnus of Sens,³ commissioned Theodulf as his suffragan to write on the subject. This is quite the most original of Theodulf's books, and is highly praised by the most recent writer⁴ on the subject, so that its teaching cannot be said to be even now antiquated.

In 813 Charles died, and was succeeded by Louis the Pious, who paid a visit to Orleans the next year and showed marked favour to Theodulf. But clouds were already begin-

¹ Cuissard, p. 279. Neander, *Hist.* v. 176 (trans.), says Soissons and Metz.

² *Carm.* iii. 593.

³ Magnus's own treatise, which was very short, was seen by Sirmond, but escaped general notice till M. Cuissard found a copy in Orleans MS.

⁴ Canon Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 220, calls his account of the sacrament 'rich and precise.'

ning to darken his horizon. His old friend Leidrad, with other trusted counsellors of Charles, was forced into voluntary banishment. As yet he was not suspected, and in 816 was charged to conduct Pope Stephen V., who came to crown the new emperor at Rheims, back again to Rome. The Pope conferred on him the title of archbishop and the pallium of a metropolitan. But the journey was fatal to his interests. Bernard, son of Pepin, the second son of the late emperor, was also in attendance on the Pope. After his father's death he had been made ruler of Italy. But when Louis this year made a fresh division of the empire between his three sons, Bernard complained that his rights were taken away, and raised the standard of revolt. The Italian nobles were eager for independence and supported him, but they were defeated and the rebellion sternly suppressed. Bernard's eyes were put out and he died in prison. The bishops who sympathized with him were condemned by a synod held at Aix-la-Chapelle and banished to different monasteries. Among them was Theodulf, who was shut up in Angers, where he lived for three or four years in sorrowful plight. To a man of his energy close confinement must have been peculiarly trying. His poems of this period strike a note of pathetic sadness. He was once offered release through Modoin, bishop of Angers, to whom he had complained bitterly of the injustice done him.¹

‘*Servus habet propriam et mendax ancillula legem,
Opilio, pastor, nauta, subulcus, arans.
Pro dolor, amisit hanc solus Episcopus, ordo
Qui labefactatur nunc sine lege sua.*’

He was offered liberty on condition that he would make a public confession of his share in the rebellion. He indignantly refused to purchase liberty at the expense of truth, and protested his innocence. To Aiulfus, bishop of Bourges, he writes,

‘*(Crede) Me objecti haudquaquam criminis esse reum.*’

So he lingered on in confinement, solacing his mind with poetry, describing scenes which his friends had witnessed and told him evidently to cheer him; the drying-up of the Sarthe in February 820, and some wonderful battles of birds. The circumstances of his death are shrouded in mystery. Letaldus, monk of Micy, affirms that by a strange reversal of fortune he was restored to the king's favour, but was poisoned by his enemies on the eve of return to the possessions of which they

¹ Carm. iv. 379.

² *Ibid.* iv. 306.

had robbed him. This is possible, for, in defiance of the canons, Jonas had held his bishopric since 818, while Theodulf had not been deposed. The decree of the Council of Thionville in this year 821, which granted a general amnesty to political prisoners, came too late. On September 18, most probably at Angers, according to the evidence of his epitaphs, his long and troubled life was ended, and in faith he died.

'Aureliana fuit sedes mihi, cujus in oris
Inter oves vellem ossa locanda meas.
Sed quia judicio Domini meruisse sepulchrum
Istud præsumo, hic habitare volo.'¹

It would be difficult to estimate the value of Theodulf's influence as a bishop. He found the clergy ignorant, covetous, bad-tempered, vain, sunk in sloth and sensuality. He did not spare them in his denunciation of their bad example:

'Haud vetat hic vinum si sese ingurgitet illo :
Ebrius haud populo sobrius esto canet.'

He set before them a noble example of witness for truth and zeal in work, which is the best safeguard against temptation.

'Adsertor veri perversique dogmatis hostis.'²

In the celebrated capitularies, published after some ten years' experience, we read the best evidence of his earnestness in the work of reform. And the spirit of his plan was distinctly practical. He set himself chiefly to reform the clergy of the country districts, to whom, removed from their bishop's immediate supervision, came the most deadly temptations to indolence and vice. He set them a threefold task of prayer, study, and manual labour. And he called upon them to use their best powers in the work of education. His was almost the only voice³ raised to advocate not only the education of candidates for the priesthood, but of all children whose parents were willing to send them to school. His priests were to teach them regularly, and were charged not to accept any fees unless the parents of their own free will sent a small gift.⁴ But, while thus providing free education for the poor, he did not forget the needs of the upper classes, and directed that nephews or other relations of priests should be sent to the Cathedral School of St. Cross or the monastic schools of St. Anianus, St. Benedict (Fleury), or St. Liphard (Meung).

The education provided was such as Theodulf had himself received. He has left a poem on a picture which illustrated

¹ Gall. *Christ*, viii. 1422.

³ Guizot, *Hist. Civ. in France*, ii. 23.

² Carm. v. 512, 650.

⁴ Cap. xx.

the seven liberal arts. M. Cuissard explains it as a table with medallions, on which was represented the tree of learning with a symbolical figure of Grammar at the root, holding a whip for the idle and a sword for the extirpation of vice; next come Rhetoric, Dialectic with Logic and Ethics on its branches, Physics, Music, Geometry, Astronomy. This is practically the same course as was given by Alcuin at Tours. But while Alcuin shrank from the reading of classical authors and rebuked his pupil Sigulf roundly for reading Virgil—Theodulf, as we have stated above, recommended such reading. Doubtless it was a poem in the classical style which came to him from his scholars at St. Cross, and pleased him so much that he answered it in a charming little poem, to explain that he could not write at length on the eve of a festival.¹

As we have seen, he had studied geography, and some of his allusions (*e.g.* to Hannibal at Cannæ) show acquaintance with ancient history. A ninth-century manuscript from Fleury, preserved at Berne, containing the Theodosian Code and other legal documents, proves that law was studied. M. Cuissard has also found some hints of the study of medicine.

For all classes, religious instruction was put in the first place. They were to learn the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer for daily use and in preparation for confirmation. In Cap. 21 the way of Christian living was put before them on the very lines of our Church Catechism, with an exhortation to love the Lord their God, and their neighbours, with warnings against besetting sins, and encouragement in the way of self-sacrifice and Christian forbearance.

The question has been raised, Why did not Theodulf protest against the immorality of the court?² He shows acquaintance with members of the king's literary circle and officers of the household, but appears to distress himself only about 'the insufferable Scot whose name is left to conjecture, but whose criticisms and character were both apparently distasteful to him as a Goth.' To this question the answer probably is, because he never stayed any length of time at court; and when occupied with the cares of his diocese, if scandalous tales ever reached him, he would not feel called upon to investigate them. The state of things revealed in his *Penitential* shows a low level of morality. But in establishing a code of discipline for all kinds of sin, he of course included

¹ Carm. ii. 591; iv. 1.

² Mr. Wilson's article in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*

many offences which might be rare, and we must not conclude that the villages of his diocese were very sinks of moral iniquity. The Franks were many of them only half-Christianized, rough men of gross appetites and unrestrained passions, and they required firm dealing and plain speaking. So Theodulf forbade his priests to enter a public-house of any kind, and gave even the most ignorant a plain message to deliver against all ungodliness. But with the stern restrictions placed on the clergy there is mingled the strain of modern sympathy, noticed above in the poem to Gisla. They are told expressly that they may take refreshments offered them in private houses by fathers of families, if in return for the food of the body they offer spiritual counsel as the food of their souls.¹

One of the great difficulties of the time was in dealing with the irregularities of priests who were appointed chaplains to great nobles to serve in private oratories, or wandered about the country with no fixed charge, uncontrolled by episcopal authority. The roving life of the king's court, which was constantly on the move, set the fashion, for of course he took his chaplains with him. The result was that unworthy men often bought the privilege of ordination, and under the protection of some wealthy landowner set the bishops at defiance. Royal capitularies against ordination to no fixed cure were issued in 789 and 794, but with little effect. Theodulf in view of these difficulties did his best to draw the people to the services of the regular parish churches,² forbidding them to attend private masses on Sunday. And at the public service at the third hour he directed his priests to preach in the words of Scripture if they knew them, if not in their own words. He promised that when he met them in their next synod he would be ready to listen to all their difficulties, and would give them all the help and encouragement in his power. Who would not be proud to serve under such a leader?

Theodulf had occasion to deal with the growing custom of solitary masses, which he strongly condemned, as he asks, 'How can the priest say "The Lord be with you" when there are none to respond?' And while he exhorted his people to communicate more frequently, he urged upon them very solemnly the duty of careful preparation. He was also opposed to the extravagant custom of pilgrimages.

¹ Cap. xiii.

² Cap. xlv. xlv. He excepts inmates of nunneries, who were allowed to worship in seclusion.

'Non tantum isse juvat Romam, bene vivere quantum
Vel Romæ, vel ubi vita agitur hominis.
Non via credo pedum, sed morum ducit ad astra :
Quis quid ubique gerit spectat ab arce Deus.'

One of his best works of the charity which begins at home was the building of a refuge for strangers (p. 253) (*Xenodochium*), where the sick were cared for and the poor relieved.

He also built a church at Germigny, which he is said to have consecrated to God as Creator and Saviour of all things. A mosaic inscription gives the date 806, 'sub invocatione S. Genevræ et S. Germini.'

What remains of the original building is still debateable ground of archæologists, and M. Cuissard's learned chapter contains so much special pleading to prove that Theodulf was an innovator in architecture, that it is not convincing to an ignorant mind.

His Recension.—In the new edition of the Latin Testament the Bishop of Salisbury refers to the Theodulfian Recension of the Bible as contained in two manuscripts. One is in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 24142), which gives substantially the same text as the famous *Codex Amiatinus*, written in the monastery of Wearmouth, but it has been corrected into Theodulf's text. The other is in the National Library at Paris (9380), and was formerly the property of Theodulf, finding a home in the monastery of St. Hubert of Ardennes. The Bishop does not consider this recension so good as that of Alcuin. This opinion redounds to the credit of the English school in which Alcuin was trained. But at least it may be claimed that Theodulf could not give so much time to this work, and it is to his credit that he encouraged this abstruse branch of study, the work being carried on rather under his direction than by his pen. M. Cuissard calls attention to other manuscripts of the same school: (1) A Bible at Puy,¹ which belonged to the Cathedral of St. Cross at Orleans until the eleventh century. This may have been the bible presented to the Abbey of Fleury by Charles le Chauve after the battle of Fontanet, taken from the spoils of Lothaire. In 1471 some monks were tried before the king for the theft of a bible from the abbey. But at present it is not possible to identify it for certain.

¹ P. 177. This bible is a magnificent copy on white and purple vellum. Theodulf's verses, as a preface, are written in letters (uncial) of gold. The Psalter is in silver, with uncial capitals of gold. The other books are in minuscule and black cursive letters.

(2) Two others were found by Martiniay in the cathedrals of Carcassonne and Narbonne in the seventeenth century, which had lost the introductory verses, but they have disappeared.

(3) Another, in the National Library at Paris (119, 39), was formerly in the library of St. Germain des Prés.

(4) At Berne there is a bible (A. 9) which comes from Fleury, and has the order of books chosen by Theodulf; and there are two others which seem to be of the same school, but they have not been collated.

It seems therefore probable that the full history of the Recension has yet to be written. M. Cuissard shows how many fragments of early bibles were preserved at Fleury, some of which are now at Berne. The chief characteristic of these bibles is the order of the Books, taken from the Hebrew Bible, the Law, Prophets, Hagiographa, Apocrypha, four Gospels, writings of the Apostles. He placed the Acts with the Apocalypse. According to M. Cuissard, the Epistle to the Colossians followed those to the Thessalonians, which is the order of early Saxon copies;¹ but in the poem² it is not so.

Theodulf seems to have incorporated many readings from the LXX, and he added to his bibles a collection of Scripture passages, called *Speculum*, attributed to St. Augustine, and taken from the LXX word for word. But this does not of itself prove study of the Greek, and M. Cuissard does not quite prove his point that the Recension was founded on Spanish models. The readings given by Bishop Wordsworth do not show any general resemblance to the *Codex Toletanus* (cent. x.) as an example of the Spanish school. However, Theodulf also added to his bibles a chronicle assigned to Isidore of Seville, with a symbolical explanation attributed to St. Melito of Sardis, which does seem to point to a Spanish education.

These facts may not make us much wiser about the Recension as a whole, but they go some way towards explaining Theodulf's assertion:

'Quicquid ab Hebræo stylus Atticus atque Latinus
Sumpsit, in hoc totum codice, lector, habes.'

We cannot follow M. Cuissard into the realms of fancy when he gravely asks, 'Was not this a pleasing allusion to the future reunion of the Greek and Latin Empires meditated by Charles?'³

¹ Bishop Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 206.

² Carm. ii. 111.

³ M. Cuissard (p. 193) says that the famous interpolation, 1 John v. 7

Authorship of the sequence 'Gloria, laus et honor' (our hymn 'All glory, laud and honour').—The festival of Palm Sunday was widely observed in the eighth century. The Council of Frankfort discussed and regulated the ceremonies of the procession. And this hymn, so popular from the beginning of its history, for use on this day, has been ascribed to Theodulf since the ninth century. M. Cuissard has found some new evidence in a short ninth-century Chronicle of Fleury, now at Berne.¹ The list of abbots ends with Theodulf's name, and it is apparently the original source of the story told by Hugo of Fleury two centuries later about the release of the bishop from his prison at Angers. 'In die Palmarum præsentē ipso rege, illos pulcherrimos versus Gloriam laudis Christi personantes, qui hodie per universas Gallias ab ecclesiasticis decantantur viris, e turri in qua custodiebatur a se compositos cecinit.'

'This story,' says Mr. Wilson, 'if somewhat ludicrous, is also somewhat touching,' and he casts doubt upon it for two reasons. The hymn is found in a reputed work of Alcuin, *De Divino Officio*, who died fourteen years before Theodulf's imprisonment. But this book is now regarded as a commentary on the *Ordo Romanus* of the tenth or eleventh century. Secondly, the same story is told of another bishop, Reinold of Langres (1065-1077). But it is quite possible, as M. Cuissard suggests, that Reinold having heard the story made use of the same plan to excite royal sympathy. If the date of M. Cuissard's chronicle can be upheld, we can give some credit to the story as explaining the account of Letaldus, that he was released by a marvellous reversal of fortune.

The hymn is found in two forms, the longer of which contains references to the parishes of Angers. There need be no question of their authenticity. It is obvious that for ordinary purposes a shortened form was needed, as it is found in service-books,² while it is printed at length with the bishop's poems.

The Commentaries on the Canon of the Mass and on the Quicumque vult offer a much more difficult problem of authorship. M. Cuissard prints them from a ninth-century³ manuscript preserved at Orleans among some relics from the Fleury library. There is no doubt that this is the manu-

is excluded from the Theodulfian Bibles but Bishop Westcott (*aa loc.*) quotes it in the form found in Paris, 938o.

¹ Berne No. 306.

² St. Gall MS. 353, Cent. ix.; Pontifical at Poitiers, Cent. ix., &c.

³ Following M. L. Delisle.

script used by the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*,¹ who identified these treatises as the work of Theodulf. Baluze² quotes an old catalogue of the abbots of Fleury, which asserts that Theodulf wrote two such treatises, and the Capitulary,³ in which Theodulf directs his presbyters to hold in their memories and understand with their hearts the Catholic faith, that is, the *Credo* and the *Quicumque vult*, makes it more probable that he wrote a commentary for them on the *Quicumque*. This Capitulary has been condemned⁴ as spurious on the ground that a suffragan bishop could not issue some directions which follow on the treatment of presbyters; but the objection falls to the ground when we remember that Theodulf was for a short time raised to the dignity of archbishop, and thus would preside over the Synod whose decrees seem to be incorporated with the charge.

But the internal evidence of these documents is perplexing. That on the Mass is written in a fairly classical style, and with some religious feeling, and explains all the theological terms of the service, beginning with the versicle *Dominus vobiscum*. This is quite in the manner of George Herbert in his country church of Bemerton, who was so careful to explain these words that his people might really pray for him, as he for them.

But the contrast of style⁵ in the second commentary is very marked, and it is difficult to believe that they had the same author. Some of the grammatical errors are doubtless due to the copyist; but the learning shown in the *De Ordine Baptismi* is far superior to the laboured explanations in the commentary, and its loose⁶ use of certain terms. It has most interesting points of connexion with the (so-called) Fortunatus, Paris, and Troyes commentaries, and that to which Bishop Bruno gave his name. But in some cases the sentences⁷ quoted are not at all improved by alteration, and

¹ iv. 143.² Miscell. i. 492.³ *Ibid.* ii. 99, Sirmond's edition.⁴ Swainson, *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, p. 289. Cf. Art. 'Theodulf' in *Dict. Christian Biography*.⁵ *Com. on Mass*: 'Christus græce unctus dicitur latine.' Cf. *De Ord. Bapt. Com. on Quicumque*: 'Is sermo est in nostra locutione unctus.'⁶ *Com. on Mass*: *suscipere* and *assumere humanum corpus*. *De Ord. Bapt.*: *suscipere* and *assumere humanitatem*. *Com. on Quicumque*: *percipere, apprehendere, accipere*.⁷ E.g. Where the Fortunatus *Com. on Clause 35* has 'Quia si sol aut ignis aliquid immundum tetigerit, quod tangit purgat et se nullatenus coinquinat,' Theodulf (?) has: 'Sicut ignis, quod accipit, purgat et non desistit quod non sit; at ipse Dei filius quando accepit humanitatem nostram,

it is surprising that M. Cuissard (p. 73) should accept the supposed authorship of Theodulf so readily.

We must now conclude this review of a singularly pure, upright, and lovable character, a shining light in a dark age. It may seem to us that the long complaints in somewhat stilted poetry, poured forth by Theodulf from his prison, to a certain extent lessen the dignity of his character at the close of his life. But the men of his generation probably thought them manly and natural, and his refusal to gain liberty by an untrue confession showed unbroken strength of will to suffer and be strong. We owe a debt of gratitude to the captive whose nobler energies were spent on the hymn which was the delight of our childhood, and which year by year, when Palm Sunday comes round, renews so many sacred memories.

This generation has seen the mantle of Theodulf fall on the shoulders of a worthy successor in the see of Orleans, the late Bishop Felix Dupanloup. Both were distinguished by the same simplicity of mind, the same childlike nature, which finds its natural joy in ministering to children. The directness of teaching which made the fame of Dupanloup as a catechist is the echo of the Charge of Theodulf. While they used all the resources of a large experience and wide learning to interest and instruct, they desired less to teach the mind than touch the heart.

In Theodulf's 21st Capitulare he gives a short sketch of the duties of the Christian life, in which he sets first, Love of God, the keeping of His commandments, love of our neighbours, taking up the cross to follow Christ, to set nothing before the love of Christ, not to continue in wrath, every hour to keep guard over our actions, in every place to know for certain that God's eye is upon us, when evil thoughts come into the heart at once to cast them upon Christ (to destroy) and lay them bare before a spiritual director, not to love many words, nor much laughter, nor laughter that is forced, in the love of Christ to pray for our enemies, using these instruments of spiritual art ('instrumenta artis spiritualis') that in the day of judgment they may be again sealed, and we may enter into the joy of our Lord.

This advice agrees exactly with Dupanloup's famous book on Catechising, the pith of which is contained in the words: 'The week-day Catechism is above all things a work of conversion, a ministry in which one goes forth to the conquest of

non desistat suam divinitatem quod non sit, sicut sol quod accepit purgat et non desistat quia ille non sit.' In the *De Ord. Bapt.* Theodulf has: 'Nunquam desiit esse cum Patre.'

souls . . . for without this deep transformation of mind and heart nothing has been done by it.'

Thus these noble bishops, divided by the lapse of a thousand years, yet one in the undivided faith of Christ, sought in the religious education of the young to do the noblest work of reformation which men can undertake, and in that spirit of firmness, patience, and love which alone can ensure success.

In this age of many experiments in social reform, we cannot afford to overlook any of the suggestions which promise to perform wonders by elaborate organization. But our faith in many of these is soon shaken, while much time is spent in giving them each a trial. Let us plead then, with all possible earnestness, for the work of religious education which is always going on, and which purifies the full tide of national life at the sources of all its streams. Education without religion has been proved a failure, and therefore Theodulf's words ought to be written in letters of gold over every school door :

'Nihil amoris Christi præponere.'

ART. VIII.—DR. PUSEY.

Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, Doctor of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Edited and prepared for Publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTONE, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Oxford, and the Rev. ROBERT J. WILSON, M.A., Warden of Keble College, Hon. Fellow and formerly Tutor of Merton College. 2 vols. Fourth edition. (London, 1893.)

IN these two substantial volumes we have the first instalment of the Life of one who has exercised an influence second to none in the history of the Church of England. We have waited for it with some impatience, but now that it is before us the wonder is how, in constant weakness of health, and even suffering, its author could have produced a work so finished and so full of deep research and minute detail. Every point relating to the subject of the memoir is amply discussed and cleared, and yet the style is so bright and transparent that, full as the volumes are, there is no sense of encumbering matter or tediousness from beginning to end. Most remarkable is the scrupulous care with which the author

has treated Dr. Pusey's early connexion with the German theologians, bringing to bear a mass of somewhat recondite information on the great theologians and thinkers of the third decade of this century. He has evidently been entrusted with a vast amount of correspondence, not only from the family and friends of Dr. Pusey, but also from some of those who were most opposed to him, as the late Mr. Simcox Bricknell and Dr. Symonds, Warden of Wadham. The book is throughout enlivened by touches of that chastened humour which so strikingly belonged to its author, as well as some irresistible reflections on the extreme shortsightedness and folly of those who, thinking to stamp out by the expression of their disapproval that which, because they did not understand it, startled them, did in reality help forward the obnoxious teaching. We have now before us a history as complete as possible of this remarkable movement of what may be called the heart of the Church of England towards the 'ancient paths.' The *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, Sir William Palmer's Notes, the late Dean Church's most instructive volume, the letters of J. B. Mozley and of Newman, the notices of Mr. Keble by Sir John Coleridge and lately by Mr. Lock—though neither portrait is quite satisfying—the *Reminiscences* of T. Mozley, the *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*—have brought the events and the persons before us in strong light and under different aspects. This exhaustive *Life of Dr. Pusey* completes the whole. And the future Collier or Perry or Dixon who writes the history of these stirring times will find the amplest materials ready to his hand.

In dealing with the work before us it is to be remarked that we have, in fact, only two years more than half of Dr. Pusey's entire life. Beginning with the year 1800—in which he was born—it carries us on to 1845, when, to the grief of so many, John Henry Newman left the Church of his baptism to join the Roman communion. Much indeed, therefore, remains to be told, and that, perhaps, the most interesting, when, left to himself at Oxford, though with John Keble in the country to support him, Pusey stood firmly and bravely maintaining the true position of the Church of England, steadying unstable souls, comforting and guiding penitents, and watching over and largely subsidizing every good work. In these volumes we have what we may term the history of the making of the man—his boyhood and youth, his early manhood, the story of his mental development, his studies, his friendships, his most happy but short-lived marriage, his relations with Newman, his treatment at the hand of the famous Hebdoma-

dal Board of Oxford, his rally to the Church when Newman departed.

Edward Bouverie Pusey was born on August 22, 1800. To his father, the Honourable Philip Bouverie, though entirely innocent of Pusey blood, the ancient Pusey domain had been bequeathed by Miss Jane Allen Pusey, the last remnant of the old Pusey stock. At seven years of age the boy was sent to a school at Mitcham, famous for good preparatory work, where he learnt those principles of accurate scholarship which we might even call the morality of scholarship, which so distinguished him in after life. At eleven, like his elder brother Philip and his younger brother William, he went on to Eton, and was received into the house of Mr. Carter, afterwards Vice-Provost, where he remained for six years. He was third oppidan when he left Eton, and had made friendships with many, more especially with Richard Jelf, afterwards head of King's College and Canon of Christ Church, few of whom, however, seem to have had much effect upon him or to have come much in his path in after life. His career at Eton seems to have been that of a well brought up, right-minded lad, without any special token of brilliancy, though thoughtful and fond of study. But the Eton of that day was full of teaching to such a boy. There was a tradition of scholarship, a sort of atmosphere of exquisite Latin composition, a love of literature, which could not fail to impress a mind like his, and prepare it in the best possible manner for the severer studies of his University. This was clenched by a residence for two years under the roof of Dr. Maltby, afterwards Bishop of Durham, who, however lacking in appreciation of theology, had been senior Chancellor's medallist at Cambridge, and was noted as an excellent scholar. Thus armed and furnished with what is so important in a young man's career, viz. a high standard of what has to be done, Edward Pusey proceeded to Oxford. His college was Christ Church, which had been raised by Dean Cyril Jackson to the highest point of popularity, and it is there that we find the first germs of that Titanic industry which distinguished him in after days. His friend Parker regrets his 'suicidal practice of reading sixteen or seventeen hours a day.' Jelf writes that 'Pusey reads most desperately and it is as much as I can do to make him take an hour's exercise.' He himself describes his later undergraduate 'life at Christ Church as that of a reading automaton who might by patience be made a human being' (i. 31). While no traces, save some few notebooks, remain of what during this time he read, it is pretty clear that he made himself master of all the received curriculum

of classic literature. 'You have read, I believe,' says about this time his friend Parker, 'the *Phanissae* of Euripides, indeed it is needless to ask you whether you have read it, for I always find that you are acquainted with any works that I casually mention' (i. 32). He took his degree (1st class) after a *viva voce* examination by John Keble, and paper work, in which his extraordinary memory and amount of knowledge caused the examiner (the Rev. G. Porter, of Queen's College) to 'predict his future greatness.' He was, he said, 'the man of greatest ability that he had ever examined or known. He placed him far above Newman.' Then followed a holiday tour, of which a Diary still remains, testifying to the minuteness of his observation of men and things, and his keen appreciation of 'the beauty of the natural world.'

Just at this time two strong forces acted upon Pusey's mind and exercised no small influence on his future. Even as a boy his affections had been greatly moved towards Miss Maria Raymond Barker, of Fairford Park, Gloucestershire. The attachment, for various reasons, was discountenanced by the friends of both, and this seems to have cast him for a time into a condition of despondency, which led him to take up with the Byronic tone, which then, and even long afterwards, was a very common phase of the youthful English mind. The other was more important. It was an effort to deliver an intimate friend from the snare of unbelief. The friend who in Dr. Pusey's *Life* goes by the name of Z. was a man of no small learning, especially in French philosophical and infidel writings, and he parried Pusey's arguments with considerable vigour.

'He brought before and impressed on Pusey's mind the living energy of unbelief as a fact in the modern world of most serious and threatening import. He endowed Pusey with a conviction, that had much to do with shaping his life for sixty years, that the Faith of Christ had, in the very heart of Christendom, implacable enemies, just as ready to crush it out of existence, if they could, as any who confronted the Apostles or the Church in the three first centuries. . . . In later years Pusey referred from time to time to this correspondence. . . . On June 15, 1882, three months before his death, he said that when twenty-two he had been obliged to read an infidel book in order to help a friend. "That," he continued, "was my first real experience of the deadly breath of infidel thought upon my soul. I never forget how utterly I shrank from it. It decided me to devote my life to the Old Testament; as I saw that that was the point of attack in our defences which would be most easily breached"' (i. 46, 49).

These two circumstances, most dissimilar as they were, seem,

nevertheless, to have combined in one result—that of developing the youth into a thoughtful man, with definite purpose and aim before him. He was now twenty-three years old, and already his reputation as a scholar had begun to shape itself. The Oriel Fellowship, at that time the 'blue ribbon' of Oxford, was won by him, and in the next year the Latin Essay, the subject being 'Coloniæ apud Græcos et Romanos inter se Comparatio.' The concluding sentence of this Essay is worth quoting, as testifying to the deep sense of religion which, even in the midst of University honours and social life, had possession of his heart.

'Silent artes Græciæ, dissipatæ sunt Romanæ res, Christi vero fidem sempiternis sæculorum ætatibus auctam usque adeo fore, certissimo testimonio abunde constat, donec, extincto quodcumque pravum est aut inhumanum, uno caritatis vinculo ultimas terras comprehenderit' (i. 65).

Now came the eventful visit to Germany, which exercised so remarkable an influence on his after life. Evidently it was closely connected with the late discovery, which had so strongly impressed him, of the widespread and subtle nature of the infidel opinions which his friend Z. had taken up.

'He had two main objects in going to Germany. His correspondence with his unbelieving "friend," and the inquiries into which it had led him, satisfied him that he had to deal with larger questions than he had supposed. These questions, he thought, could be studied most thoroughly at Universities in which faith and a scarcely undisguised unbelief had been in conflict for more than a generation' (i. 70).

He left Oxford in June 1825, and returned at the end of the long vacation, in the middle of October, having made friends of most of the more eminent professors at Göttingen and Berlin, and greatly moved by what he saw, becoming more and more resolved to work for positive truth.

'I can remember,' he said in 1878, 'the room in Göttingen in which I was sitting when the real condition of religious thought in Germany flashed upon me. I said to myself, "This will all come upon us in England, and how utterly unprepared for it we are!"' (i. 77).

With this strongly in his mind he made a second visit to Germany in 1826, residing mostly at Berlin and Bonn. He had already studied Hebrew at Oxford; here he began Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic, working, with his usual unflinching determination, fourteen hours a day. 'Si quæ,' as he writes in the preface to his *Catalogue of Oriental MSS. in the Bodleian*

Library, 'ad linguam sacram codicemque Divinum melius intelligendum, aliquid inde perciperem.' His chief friends were Tholuck, Schleiermacher, Neander, Hengstenberg, Ewald, and Kosegarten, all men of much learning and piety, thoroughly orthodox according to Lutheran teaching, and such that, as was made plain in his controversy with Hugh James Rose, he was at one time inclined to lose sight of the root error of the German Reformation and minimise the causes of the Rationalism which was its natural result. About this time he proposed to himself the gigantic task of revising the authorised translation of the Old Testament, a work which, after labouring at it for some time, he put aside, and even felt 'regret and pain' that he had undertaken it. He told the present writer, who was asking his opinion about the late revision of the authorised translation, that manuscripts and traditional interpretations existed in the early part of the seventeenth century which had greatly guided the original translators, but which had now been lost. There is much that we would linger over at this time—his keen perception of the weakness of what was called Evangelical preaching, as shown in a letter to Miss Barker; his view as to those apparent contradictions in Holy Scripture which have at all times worried a certain class of minds, viz. that 'they exist without diminishing from its sacredness, inspiration, authority, or credibility;' his wise treatment of the question, 'Shall I be saved?' his prescient words about the results of education outside of religion; his reflections during the severe illness when he was sent to Brighton to recruit. All is very striking, marking an unusual seriousness of mind and grace of expression for a young man of twenty-seven, not even in deacon's orders.

And now events followed rapidly one after another. In the year 1828 that appointment was made to the provostship of Oriel on which great results, as we now see, hinged, and concerning which Dean Church, Dr. Newman, and T. Mozley have largely written; when the scale hung between Edward Hawkins, an able, strong-willed, narrow-minded man, and John Keble, the great Christian poet, the great scholar, the one man of great merit, who from the beginning realised and loved the Church. It is, perhaps, futile to speculate on the course which events would have followed had Newman and Pusey given their votes for Keble. But one may fairly believe that R. J. Wilberforce and Newman would not have been put out of the tuition of the college, nor, later on, would Pusey have been censured and silenced by the

Hel
cin
the
can
refe
with
side
'Th
serm
Coll
To

kne
amo
ther
sam
seer
sepa
innoc
that
aug
and
life,
case
Mis
The
of t
the
on v
and
had
our
by l
his
No
as i
was
the
con
prof
high
For
'pu
toge
as

Hebdomadal Board. Whether under much more favourable circumstances, and the cessation of hostility on the part of the authorities, Newman would have remained with us, who can say? Never in the later years of his life did Dr. Pusey refer to the decision which he took on this occasion without adding a word of self-reproach for what he considered his failure to read the true significance of character. 'The whole of the later history of our Church,' he said, in the sermon preached at the dedication of the chapel of Keble College, 'might have been changed had we been wiser. . . . To us it became a sorrow of our lives' (i. 139).

At this time came his marriage. To us who mostly knew Dr. Pusey as living a retired and ascetic life, buried among books and papers in his somewhat confined study, there are few portions of his life more interesting, and at the same time more difficult to comprehend, than this. He seemed so raised above the ordinary ways of human life, so separated from all that is temporal and earthly, however innocent and permissible, so wrapt up in the things of God, that it is difficult to imagine him as a lover, or caring for aught but the things of the Lord, to be holy 'both in body and spirit.' Certainly it may be said that, like all else in his life, his courtship—if such a word may be used in such a case—was deeply tinged with religion. His letters to Miss Barker are by no means those of an ordinary lover. They are the outpourings of a mind set on divine things—full of teaching, fearless in expression, as to one whose sympathy the writer can fully trust. It is interesting to read his views on various subjects, such as Fasting, Liberalism, and the like, and to find how greatly they altered in his later days. 'We had no sufficient information,' he said, 'and we were feeling our way.' He was married at St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, by his friend R. W. Jelf, on June 12, 1828, eleven days after his ordination as deacon at Christ Church by Bishop Lloyd. No marriage could have been happier. The young pair had, as it seemed, life in all its pleasantest forms before them. He was even then marked out as one of the most learned men of the University; one who had attained the highest honours, well connected, endowed with fair means, certain to rise in his profession; while his young wife was no ordinary person, but highly cultivated and well calculated to shine in social life. For nine years they lived, helping one another in all that is 'pure and lovely and of good report,' bearing the sorrows together bravely that fall in the way of family life; gradually, as it seemed, weaning themselves from the world, making

sacrifice of earthly comfort and earthly dignity, as when she sold her jewels, and *he* their carriage and horses, in order to make the noble offering of 5,000*l.* to the Bishop of London's effort to build churches in Bethnal Green; till, on Trinity Sunday, in 1839, the great blow, the sorrow of his life, fell upon him, and after a long, trying illness she passed away, and he was left with three delicate children to face a lonely life. Nothing is more characteristic than his complete resignation and acceptance of the will of God. 'A little before her departure I made upon her forehead the mark of the Cross, which she loved, and gave the blessing, "To God's mercy and protection we commend thee." She was engaged in the struggle with her last enemy, who now is conquered. "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory"' (ii. 100).

It is not too much to say that this one great loss was the turning point of his life. Absolutely blameless as it had ever been, and devoted to the highest objects, there yet remained the taking up of the Cross in all its fullness and following Christ. From this time forth his life, in the fullest manner, 'was hid with Christ in God.' He had absolutely broken with the world. Like St. Paul it was crucified to him, and he to the world. He lived most abstemiously; declined all society of the ordinary kind; lived, as we remember him, in his most plainly-furnished study; lived for the Church generally and for the work of souls.

But we must retrace our steps and cast a rapid glance on the controversy between Dr. Pusey and Hugh James Rose, arising from some stray expressions used by the latter, in a course of University sermons, as to the state of religious thought and speculation in Germany. These seemed to Pusey, from what Tholuck and others like him said, exaggerated and unfair. Without entering into details, it is sufficient to say that while Rose's utterances were far behind Dr. Pusey's *Apology* in learning and depth, there can be little doubt that both as to facts and causes his statements were only too true. Pusey's book entitled *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character of the Theology of Germany*, was translated into German, was answered by Rose, and reinforced by a second part, published in May 1830. In after years Pusey felt strongly that he had used words and expressions which certainly were at least liable to be misunderstood, more particularly in regard to the inspiration of the Holy Scripture, on which Rose had naturally fastened, and which, it should seem, were brought against him in 1841.

'As the subject has been revived,' he writes, 'I am glad of an opportunity of expressing regret of having ever spoken at all upon the subject of minute discrepancies in Holy Scripture. . . . I ever believed the plenary inspiration of the whole Bible and every sentence in it, as far as any doctrine or practice can be elicited from it. I ever believed the human instruments to have been guided by God's Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit never failed them ; only I did not think that while He guided them 'into all truth' this guidance extended into such minute details . . . as in no way affected the truth' (i. 174). And once more, in writing to Rev. A. S. Farrar, 'I was dissatisfied with my books, and withdrew from circulation what remained of them. . . . I forget both : but long ago retracted something said on inspiration' (i. 175).

To the last, however, he felt anxious as to the untoward influence, as he called it, of these books. In his will, dated November 10, 1875, he desires that the two books on the theology of Germany should not be republished. And it has been supposed that the famous inscription for the porch of St. Saviour's Church at Leeds, 'Ye who enter this holy place, pray for the sinner who built it,' and that on the first stone laid, 'In the Name of Penitent,' had some special reference to this incident of his life.

Very quickly after his marriage—when, indeed, he had hardly made up his mind where to fix his residence—he was appointed—mainly through the influence of Bishop Lloyd, of Oxford, who had noted his remarkable talents, and still more remarkable industry—to the Regius Professorship of Hebrew. No post could possibly have been more suitable to him, or could have better met his wishes. He looked at it at once from a religious point of view, and it is not a little remarkable that in his letter of thanks to the Duke of Wellington, then Prime Minister, he speaks, making an accidental mistake, of being appointed to the Regius Professorship of *Divinity*, as though in his mind the two—Hebrew and Divinity—had been unconsciously connected. Another slight incident is worth recording, as an instance of that old-fashioned courtesy which belonged to his nature, and which is not too constantly met with in the present day. 'What will Pusey do?' said a clergyman who was staying at Cuddesden when the news was brought of the appointment. 'If,' said the Bishop, 'he belongs to the old school, he will come over and see me ; if to the new, he will write me a letter.' It is needless to say that Pusey belonged to the old school—and drove over at once from his brother's house to offer his thanks to the Bishop. With the professorship, splendid as the position was for one so young, came

work enough to daunt the spirit of most men. Besides the lectures which he gave, after most conscientious preparation, on Genesis and Isaiah, and his duties as canon of a cathedral church, he undertook a most wearisome task, the completion of the *Supplementary Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, and the indexing of the whole, which had been begun by his predecessor, Dr. Nicoll. It is impossible to estimate the labour which this involved. Many of the manuscripts had suffered from long neglect ; several were mutilated ; portions of one manuscript were bound up with another. Two previous attempts had been made on somewhat unscholarly lines, and what with crafty forgeries, crabbedly written notes of others, the variety of dates, and the difficulty of deciphering Oriental handwriting, the work, as Dr. Liddon said, was gigantic. Pusey said of it in after years, that as he went in the morning to the drudgery he often envied the very bricklayers and labourers whom he saw at work in the streets. But, like all that came from him, it was thorough, done with all his might, and such that the well-known Arabic scholar De Sacy said of it, 'If Pusey had made nothing but the index to such a catalogue it would have been enough to place him in the first rank of Arabic scholars' (i. 206).

At this period of Pusey's life he took, for the first time, an active part in politics. The family politics were old-fashioned Tory—so much so that the marriage of Philip, the elder brother, with Lady Emily Herbert was not altogether relished at Pusey House, because the Carnarvon family were Whigs. The two brothers, however, as not unfrequently happens in such cases, had thought for themselves, and saw the great evils and abuses which it was supposed to be the prerogative of the Whigs to remedy. Their instincts, therefore, were what were called 'Liberal.' On various occasions Pusey had expressed himself strongly in favour of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and he also advocated Roman Catholic Emancipation, which at this time, 1829, was one of the great questions of the day. Sir Robert Peel, after having taken a strong line in opposing this, had by this time become convinced of its necessity, and had resigned his seat in Parliament as member for the University, being, however, willing to stand again, on the expressed wish of the constituency. Sir Robert Inglis, who was the successful candidate, was invited to oppose him. The contest was exciting, and it is not a little interesting to find Pusey's name associated with those of Blanco White, Shuttleworth, and Hawkins against Keble, Newman, Froude, and Robert Wilberforce.

We pass over his thoughtful *Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions*, merely remarking, however, that it was a bold effort to show how—without resorting to the revolutionary measures proposed by Lord Henley and others—cathedral establishments, mainly by a better choice of occupants, might occupy a most important position in the system of the Church. He is in favour of making each cathedral a place which would as far as possible provide for the education 'of the clergy of each diocese within its own precincts' (i. 231), and which would give leisure to scholarly men to do literary work for the Church. He had not, however—as his biographer notices—grasped the idea 'of the great duties which a cathedral owes to the diocese of which it is the mother church, and to the poor, in whose hearts it should find a place as their cherished resort and home' (i. 232).

Thus far the life of Dr. Pusey, interesting as it is, is but the life of a very holy, high-minded, able man, with views somewhat unformed, though ever gravitating towards the right and true. It is the life of a pious scholar, full of insight and ideas, bent upon fulfilling to the very uttermost those academical and other duties to which he had been called. Full of high aspirations, feeling and supporting with all his heart the 'beauty of holiness,' he had not as yet taken any special line in regard to what are called Church principles. In a letter to Bishop Lloyd he had described his opinions as 'practically the same as those of the High Church,' and had added, 'However I may respect individuals, I feel myself more and more removed from the Low Church.' He had also in his sermons set forth a high view of the Sacraments. He had perceived in the Psalms the constant presence of our Lord. Above all, in his letters are quotations from that small book which has stirred so many hearts, *The Christian Year*, whose first edition was published in the year 1827.

Can we not see in all this the preparation for that great work which lay before him, when he should be called by Divine Providence to be chief of those great men to whom, under God, the Church owes the reclamation of truths well-nigh lost—the 'building again,' so to say, 'of the Tabernacle of David, which had fallen down'; that new life which has never ceased to flow vigorously in so many hearts, and which has done so great things both at home and abroad? It was in 1833 that the first movement was made in Oxford. The circumstances which led to it, as well as the direct action of Newman and others, have been so often described that few

words are needed before introducing Dr. Pusey on the field. But it may be as well to mention two or three considerations on which, as it seems to us, sufficient stress has hardly even yet been laid. The Church of England inherited from the days before the Reformation its status as a true branch of the Catholic Church, particularly as that branch which claimed the allegiance of all of the English race. This allegiance was for the most part freely given. Her Convocations were respected as the voice of the Church; her discipline of censure and excommunication was maintained to a very late period—certainly in full force till the beginning of the eighteenth century. Her clergy were looked upon as ordained men, whose ministrations brought with them the authority of our Lord. And although, as before so after the Reformation, there were recusants and complainers, yet up and down the land, in the great towns and in the country villages, the Church was accepted and revered, and defaulters were few and far between. Some of us are old enough to remember the days when, the old traditions still lingering on, tradesman, mechanic, labourer, all, as a matter of course, looked on the Church as the true religion, and at least on Sundays—sometimes also on Litany days and Saints' days—attended her ministrations. 'While men slept the enemy sowed the tares.' That old conservative feeling, strong as it is in English hearts, yet needed confirming by regular systematic teaching of those doctrines which justified the Church's claims. In too few cases had this been done. The clergy took it for granted that all was well. And the dread and dislike of all that savoured of sacerdotal or Romish teaching made it difficult to expound those principles which England holds in common with Rome, and which differentiate the Church from the various Dissenting bodies. During the last century the teaching was of an ethical and moral nature, or in the way of apology for Christianity against the attacks of the Freethinkers. It was succeeded by what no doubt was more stirring, though not less insufficient, viz. the subjective religion of Wesley and of that which was called the Evangelical School, which was, in fact, the religion invented by Luther to oppose the sale of indulgences carried on by Tetzel. Yet, little as perhaps those imagined it who so earnestly taught what was called *personal* religion, the result was most injurious to the Church of England. It swept away what little remained of the idea of the Church as the one great authority to whom all owed obedience. It made feelings the test of a soul in a state of grace. It ignored the power of sacramental grace. It prac-

tically placed the Church, as far as its spiritual position was concerned, on a level with the Dissenting sects. It left little defence for its existence except the fact that it was the State religion. In the words of Mr. Sikes, given by Dr. Pusey in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury—

‘Wherever I go all about the country I see amongst the clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest, and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching: the uniform suppression of one great truth. There is no account given anywhere as far as I see of the Holy Catholic Church’ (i. 257).

He goes on to show the danger of this omission, and prophecies with strange accuracy that which would come to pass, viz. that it will have to be widely taught, and that those who teach it will have to bear endless misunderstandings, be accused of popery, and probably themselves go to dangerous lengths in their efforts to be heard.

This, then, was the condition of things when the revolutionary action of the Reform Bill of 1832 stirred up feelings of animosity to every established institution of the country, and certainly not least to the Church. There was no strength whatever, as it seemed, to oppose the enemy. Hard things were said. The bishops were warned ‘to put their house in order.’ The first step, viz. that of maiming the Irish Church, had already been taken. Fierce longing eyes were looking for another prey. Then came that wonderful stirring of the dry bones which has been so often and so graphically described, by no one more strikingly than by Newman in the *Apologia*. Newman arrived from his foreign tour panting eagerly for the fray. The brotherhood was formed of Newman, Mansell, the Kebles, Froude, Bowden, Copeland, Isaac Williams—more or less in touch with Hugh James Rose, Hook, Perceval, and Palmer, of Worcester College. J. Keble preached that remarkable sermon on ‘National Apostasy’ on July 16, 1833, which Newman ‘ever considered and kept as the start of the religious movement of 1833.’ To understand the matter fully it must ever be borne in mind that, while it is true that as a Church definite dogmatic teaching had been grossly set aside, yet from the beginning it had never lacked its witnesses. There has always been among us a stream, sometimes slender, at other times wide, of Catholic teaching. Men like Andrewes, Laud, and the bright constellation of the Caroline divines, Beveridge, Law, Sherlock, Wilson, and many others, had ever maintained the Faith. The Prayer Book, revised and settled in 1662, spoke for itself. It only needed, therefore,

for those who saw our danger—the danger of destruction ‘for lack of knowledge’—to hark back to the true Church authorities and to her best and most learned divines. The true teaching was ready to hand—the teaching of that which would kindle to enthusiasm—viz. the true position of the Church and its ministry, if only those could be found who by their dialectic and literary power could bring it home to the hearts of men. The match was applied by this famous sermon, and many hearts were set ablaze. It was at this crisis that Pusey joined those who had already arranged the fighting plan. That plan was very simple. It was to publish short startling Tracts, setting forth the great doctrines which had been obscured, and to send an address to the Archbishop. Pusey for a little time had held aloof, not perhaps quite perceiving the bearing of what was going on. When, however, he joined the party of Church defenders, he threw himself into the work with all his energy and ability. Dean Church describes him as without question the most venerated person in Oxford a little later on.

‘Without an equal, in Oxford at least, in the depth and range of his learning, he stood out yet more impressively among his fellows in the lofty moral elevation and simplicity of his life, the blamelessness of his youth, and the profound devotion of his manhood, to which the family sorrows of his later years, and the habits which grew from them, added a kind of pathetic and solemn interest.’

We may, then, imagine the joy with which Newman, as indeed he himself writes in his *Apologia*, welcomed him.

‘He at once gave us a position and a name. Without him we should have had little chance, especially at the early date of 1834, of making any serious resistance to the Liberal aggressions. I had known him well . . . and felt for him an enthusiastic admiration. I used to call him *ὁ μέγας*.’

The first Tract was published on September 9, 1833. On December 21 Tract 18 and several besides were issued with the initials E. B. P. Pusey and Newman had been intimate friends. Much correspondence had passed between them. Each admired and respected the other. Each had his own gifts. Pusey was learned, had a hopeful, sanguine mind, no fear of man, was warm-hearted and affectionate. Newman was logical, gifted with the power of writing the most refined and exquisite English, and, what was most important, of drawing to himself the hearts of young able men. It is impossible to say what the Church owes to these two men, together with John Keble, to whom Newman gives the

honour of 'turning the tide and bringing back the talent of the University to the side of the old theology.' Bishop Selwyn, in one of his charges, compared them to David's three men who, at the risk of their lives, brought the water from the well of Bethlehem, one, as he sorrowfully observed, remaining behind in the enemy's camp.

Henceforth Dr. Pusey's life is one long, resolute effort to develop and defend that which, for want of a better word, may be called the Catholic teaching of the Church of England. The authority of the Church, the grace of the sacraments, the true character of the ministry, were the great questions to which he devoted all the powers of his mind. These he steadily worked out in their various aspects, bringing them mightily to bear on that of which he never lost sight—the extension of holiness in individual souls. Of Tract 18, on 'Fasting,' he wrote to his brother—

'You will recognize it by the initials, if not by the style. My object was to induce others to think on what I had thought on myself, or rather, since I had come to the result by long and careful thinking, and that, in conformity with the admonitions of our Church, I thought it my duty to state it. I feel some hope that, by God's blessing, it may have some tendency to promote a more humble, submissive, acquiescing frame of mind towards God, in these days of tumult, self-confidence, and excitement' (i. 279).

The importance of his work in connexion with the great 'Oxford Movement,' as Dean Church calls it, is such that it seems to put out of sight all other of the many doings of his life; else we would gladly speak of his services rendered at the time when Dr. Hampden, labouring under the obloquy which naturally followed his *Bampton Lectures*, was appointed, almost insultingly, by Lord Melbourne to the Regius Professorship of Divinity; or his defence of the Subscription of members of the University at matriculation to the Thirty-nine Articles; or his efforts to improve the incomes of the small livings in the patronage of Christ Church; or the amusing passage at arms in the revising barrister's court between the great and learned Canon and a blustering Radical lawyer, who sought successfully to deprive the Canons of their votes; or his generosity in opening his house to receive 'three or four young men'—among them J. B. Mozley, who speaks of it in a letter to his mother—or the formation of the Theological Society, at which Newman, Oakeley, Copeland, Harrison, Marriott, but principally Pusey himself, read papers. All these are fascinating subjects, but we pass on to his more direct connexion with the Tractarian Movement, and more particu-

larly with Newman himself. The 67th Tract, on 'Baptism,' with a motto from the *Christian Year*, altered, it may be said, the whole character of the Tracts. Till this was written they were most useful indeed, but short and sketchy morsels of Church history, or meditations and prayer taken from books like Wilson's *Sacra Privata*. Henceforth they become most important theological treatises, full of deep thought and learning. To this deeper and more solid treatment of subjects Pusey led the way. The Tract on 'Baptism' struck at once the right note. It brought out distinctly that God's doings are not as man's doings.

'Rationalism,' he says, 'supports our evidences; reconciles our difficulties; smooths down the 'hard sayings' of the Word of God; and steals away our treasure. The Blessed Sacraments are a peculiar obstacle to its inroads, for their effects come directly from God, and their mode of operation is as little cognisable to reason as their Author; they flow to us from an unseen world' (i. 344).

Thus, as the biographer adds—

'The battle for sacramental grace was a battle for continued belief in the revelation of God in Christ' (i. 348).

The effect of this Tract was felt at once. While Rose and Newman rejoiced in this clear exposition of a truth terribly obscured and set aside, others, as the *Record* and the Evangelical party, whose line of thought practically ignored the grace of Sacraments, were scandalized and indignant. To them Calvinism and Regeneration were equivalent terms, as is shown by a letter to Dr. Pusey from an estimable clergyman of Puritan opinions, in which he writes—

'Were all the great and good men upon earth to advocate the doctrine, I would say with fearlessness, My honoured and revered brethren, you know that if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, baptized or not baptized, he is none of His' (i. 351).

It need not be said, adds Dr. Liddon, that Pusey would have said so too. It needed a mind like his to disentangle the confusion of ideas and lead the minds of men to realize what the Church has ever taught—viz. on the one hand the infusion of new life in baptism, on the other the need of conversion, or return to God, on the part of those who have fallen away.

In 1836 followed a most important undertaking—the creation of the *Library of the Fathers*. Pusey describes, in a letter to Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Greenhill, how it came to pass that the teaching of the Fathers, of which at first, like many others of modern days, he had been inclined to think but

poorly, gradually approved itself to his mind. He perceived by degrees the greater facility with which the Fathers interpreted Holy Scripture; their accordance with the ancient Jewish interpretations, which were far less antagonistic to the Christian than those of more modern times; the unanimity of these interpretations; the beauty and truth of things which he had once rejected as fanciful, the consciousness which he found in them of the mysterious depth of every word and way of God. This love of patristic literature deepened as time went on, till, to use his own favourite phrase, he 'lived in St. Augustine, so that his whole thought became saturated with that of the African father.' Sadly indeed had the clergy of the Church of England, once the 'stupor mundi' for their learning, let their learning go. The writer well remembers the astonishment expressed by some not irreligious people when Field, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, edited in most scholarly fashion St. Chrysostom's *Homilies on St. Matthew*. 'Why could he not have devoted his time to editing a Greek play?' Yet the Church of England makes her appeal to the Primitive Church, and claims union with the great Catholic Church before the division of the East and West. To reject, then, the great writers of the Church of early days would be to forfeit a great portion of her birth-right. This Pusey saw clearly, and the result was that most valuable series which goes by the name of the *Library of the Fathers*, to which the names of himself, Keble, and Newman are given as editors, to be supplemented after the secession of the latter by Charles Marriott. It is impossible to overstate the excellent results which this publication has brought to the Church. It is something to have before men's eyes the very names of Justin, Irenæus, Ephrem, the two Cyrils, Augustine, Gregory, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Ambrose, and to feel that their writings are now within reach of all. It is still more to have the witness, as in the letters of St. Cyprian, against the encroachment of Rome on the one hand, and on the other that of the Fathers, *passim*, against the novelties of Puritanism; to feel, as it were, the pulsation of the heart of Primitive Christianity, and to mark the mind of men who not only wrote, but suffered for Christ's sake. Above all is it important in an age of luxury and self-will to see what the life has been of those whom the Church has delighted to honour. All this Pusey distinctly realised. He himself led the way with a revised translation of his favourite book, St. Augustine's *Confessions*, to which he added the original text. Newman translated various treatises of St. Athanasius, and added

those notes so well known to all theologians. Dr. Pusey's accomplished son, Philip, though a life sufferer from illness, translated a portion of the works of St. Cyril of Alexandria, and added seven volumes of the revised text of the same author to those texts which partially were brought out together with the translations. To fourteen out of the fifty-eight volumes Dr. Pusey wrote most learned and helpful prefaces. The publication continued for forty-seven years, *i.e.* to three years after his death, and was completed by the latter part of St. Cyril on St. John. A figure of St. John the Baptist holding a cross, and a pendent scroll carrying the significant words, 'Vox clamantis in deserto,' was chosen as the frontispiece, and the whole was dedicated, after Pusey's dutiful fashion, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'in token of Reverence for his Person and Sacred Office and of Gratitude for his Episcopal Kindness.'

So far, indeed, the movement with which Pusey had now thoroughly identified himself seemed most hopeful. Up to 1836, in spite of some criticism on the part of bishops and a note every now and then of warning from the Erastian or Low Church public press, the party had attracted to itself many of the old-fashioned Church people, University dons and others, who saw in it little more than a brave effort to assert the claims of the Established Church against the attacks of the Whig Government, supported and egged on by the Dissenters. Now, however, affairs took a new turn—much more trying and anxious—and in the event such as would have utterly dispirited and driven from the field any one save a man endowed with Pusey's sanguine nature and strong, unwavering faith. It has been already said how in matters connected with the ministry, the sacraments, and the Church itself, the clergy had failed to teach accurately and definitely. But these most important Articles of Faith happened to be exactly those in which the Church of England is more or less in accord with the Church of Rome. It could not, therefore, be otherwise than that those who sought to restore them to their proper place in the Church's system should be accused of introducing Roman doctrine and practice. Even more dangerous than this was the fact that of that great party which most strongly advocated the revival of so much which pointed in the direction of Rome certain minds were actually carried beyond the *via media*—the watchword of the early Tractarian days—and became converts to Rome. With these two forces Dr. Pusey had to deal. He had to meet the charge of Romanizing, brought by the Low Church

party, who were beginning to wake to the fact that the Oxford teaching took up different ground from that of Simeon, Romaine, and others of their school, and at the same time he had to hold many of his friends back from that conclusion at which it was confidently prophesied by many that they would certainly arrive; and this the more because Rome, after the quiescence of many years, was now beginning, after the successful carrying of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, to lift up its head, and, not unnaturally, to avail itself of the opportunity. On this subject it is interesting to mark the first token of difference between the two friends, who had hitherto been in completest harmony. Newman had written and sent to Pusey Tract 79, on 'Purgatory.' Pusey objected to the lenient manner in which the Roman theory of Purgatory had been dealt with. Newman's words, probably having Pusey's criticism before his mind, are worth transcribing.

'Since we are in no danger of becoming Romanists, and may have to be dispassionate in the treatment of their errors, some passages in the following account of "Purgatory" are more calmly written. They would satisfy those who were engaged with a victorious enemy at their door' (ii. 8).

Yet the two worked on together—Pusey with perfect faith in the justice and ultimate success of the cause which he was upholding; Newman emerging from Low Church views, with a mind, as it seemed, ever excited and restless, soon to see in Bishop Wiseman's article and the Monophysite discussion what he calls 'the shadow of the hand on the wall.' Charges which, in these days, seem to us of the silliest kind were made against what was now 'the Oxford School.'

'Needless bowings,' complained Canon Townsend of Durham, 'unusual attitudes in prayer, the addition of a peculiar kind of cross to the surplice, and the placing the bread and wine on a small additional table near the Lord's table or altar' (ii. 15).

Dr. Pusey, in characteristically minute fashion, enters into all these foolish details in a letter to Bishop Bagot of Oxford. Here was the first beginning of those Ritualistic questions which have formed of late years so large and unsatisfactory portions of the history of the Church of England. It is well to note Dr. Pusey's mind in matters of this kind.

'We have too much to do to keep sound doctrine and the privileges of the Church to be able to afford to go into the question about dresses' (ii. 15).

While no one felt more keenly the importance of teaching the truth, both he and Mr. Keble were averse from anything

which would cause scandal or give pain. Dr. Pusey stood to the last at the north end of the altar when celebrating the Holy Communion in Christ Church Cathedral, and some of us can remember how Mr. Keble, with the requisite sum of money ready for rebuilding Hursley Church, refrained for some years from carrying out his long-cherished plan rather than disturb an old gentleman who had always occupied and loved one particular seat in the old church. This considerateness was a feature in the character of the early Tract writers which has not always been found in those who claim to succeed them.

It was not long before the fitful attacks upon what are now called 'Church principles' assumed a fiercer and more continuous character. Pusey met them in his own firm and orderly way. It is not, we think, any reflection on his own independence of thought and character to say that by this time he had learnt much from Keble, who had impressed upon him, as more or less upon all whom he admitted to his intimacy, that 'faith in God's presence and guidance which made all high-handed, self-willed action on man's part appear more or less irreverent.' This is strikingly shown in Pusey's Fifth of November Sermon, a day on which William III.'s arrival in England was commemorated, together with the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. Originally, as we have seen, of Liberal opinions (Bianco White has said of him that he was the strongest Liberal in Oxford), Keble's *ἔπεα πτερόεντα* had evidently gone home to his heart and taught him the

'temper which in the coming days of trouble would listen in silent sorrow to Church authority repudiating the principles which alone could justify its existence, but would not on that account be betrayed into disloyal desertion of the Church herself. The question has often been asked how Pusey and Keble were able to remain in the Church of England during the unhappy years when its rulers set themselves so generally to condemn them. The moral side of the answer to that question will be apparent to the careful reader of the sermon' (November 5) 'Patience and confidence the strength of the Church' (ii. 29).

'Patience and confidence,' indeed, were needed when bishop after bishop violently in their charges attacked his friends and himself (who cares to read the hard things that were said may do so in a volume put together by the late Mr. Simcox Bricknell in the year 1841); when so blameless a man as Mr. Peter Young, curate to Mr. Keble, was refused priest's ordination by Bishop Sumner, of Winchester, because he declined to accept without reservation Hooker's words on

the sacrament of the Eucharist ; when even their Diocesan, the amiable Bishop Bagot, could not refrain from joining the cry ; when Pusey himself, in the most brusque and uncourteous manner, was censured and suspended from preaching by the Hebdomadal Board ; and when friends and disciples fell away, some, like Demas, fearing obloquy and loving ease ; others, numbering among them Newman himself, his fellow-soldier in the great battle and dearest friend, mesmerised and subdued by the assertions and guiles of Rome.

But we anticipate. In 1838 Bishop Bagot in his charge had, with the very lightest hand, alluded to certain dangers which he perceived in the tone of some of the Tracts. He 'feared more for the scholars than the masters ;' but this 'being so, he conjured the latter to mind what they were about.' Newman took this very much to heart, and wrote to Pusey somewhat bitterly, making far more of the matter than it deserved. Curiously enough, in reply Pusey points to the case of La Mennais's falling from the Faith, and he greatly deprecates Newman's proposal to withdraw certain Tracts or give up the whole circulation if the Bishop desired it. Here again we see the difference between the two minds. In a conversation nearly forty years later Pusey said :

'I remember Newman saying, "Oh, Pusey ! we have leant on the Bishops and they have broken down under us !" . . . I thought to myself, "At least I never leant on the Bishops : I leant on the Church of England"' (ii. 236).

Earlier in the same volume he writes to Newman :

'I can scarcely realize what the effect of withdrawing the Tracts would be : it seems, at first sight, likely to throw everything into confusion, and to produce a sort of electric shock' (ii. 54).

The Bishop certainly had never intended his words to be taken as censure, as he explains in a subsequent letter, and the whole matter marks a strange sensitiveness in Newman, which seems to run through his history, and which one can hardly dissociate from deep-seated pride. Pusey writes in a letter to Keble—

'One must expect principles to cost something, but the withdrawal of the Tracts from circulation, and that in consequence of a Bishop's disapprobation, is a tremendous blow. . . . Such a mass to be withdrawn at once, Catenas and all ! . . . It seems a gratuitous infliction, not upon us, but upon principles' (ii. 57).

It is worth while here to mark the condition of Newman's mind.

'I do not think that you enter into my situation, nor can any one. I have for several years been working against all sorts of opposition, and with hardly a friendly voice. Consider how few persons have said a word in favour of me.' (This with a huge following of devoted men, the *élite* of the University.) '... My sole comfort has been that my Bishop has not spoken against me. ... Yet—I say it sorrowfully—he has never been my *friend*. His letting me dedicate that book to him was the only thing he has done for me. ... If he breathes but one word against the Tracts, it is more than he has said out in their favour. I *cannot* stand if he joins against me. ... I *cannot* stand against this. Even if I do not withdraw the Tracts, I see I cannot continue them' (ii. 58).

The man who writes thus is not of the sort of stuff of which great saints are made. Pusey was formed very differently. He wrote to the Bishop—

'We have put forward what in these days seem high doctrines of the Episcopal office and of obedience to it: the opponents of these views ... will be sure to catch at every expression of your Lordship's, and stretch it probably beyond its meaning' (ii. 60).

The Bishop replied, as might be expected, that his

'advice was *precautionary* and *prospective*, not *inculpatory* and *retrospective*. I think too highly of the authors and their labours in behalf of the Church not to be anxious to do all that in me lies, both to see them right and to maintain them in that position' (ii. 62).

In a note which accompanied the published charge the Bishop took pains to explain his words, and to speak cordially of 'the authors of the Tracts,' and in a second letter authorized Dr. Pusey 'to deny, if necessary, that he had intended in his charge to censure the Tracts,' and adds the excellent counsel, 'It has been suggested to me that if a Tract were written, *quite* for the *poor*, about the Daily Service, it would do good. The person suggesting it says, "It must be restored some time, and the sooner the way is paved for its restoration the better"' (ii. 64).

The 'Martyrs' Memorial,' which was the result of a meeting at a private house in Oxford, forms another episode in the campaign. Doubtless it was intended partly as a test, partly as a protest. Its promoters were anxious either to commit the Tractarian party to a recognition of the Reformation or to make manifest to a Protestant public that they were opposed to it. Pusey, after some hesitation, would not take part in the scheme unless with explanations and arrangements which the promoters declined to accept. His argument was that

'the great blessing of the Reformation is that we are not (as the Lutherans and Calvinists are) connected with any human founder

or bound up with his human infirmities. We are neither Cranmerites nor Ridleyites, but an Apostolic branch of the Church Catholic; and I fear lest this plan should tend to increase the vulgar impression that we were a new Church at the Reformation, instead of being the old one purified' (ii. 68).

The Archbishop and the Bishop of Oxford, anxious to prevent misunderstanding and to stop the mouths of those who attacked the Tracts as being opposed to the Reformation and leaning to Rome, desired greatly that Pusey should take part with the promoters of the scheme; but after many communications and much consideration this was found under the circumstances impossible; and as an alternative Pusey wrote a grand letter of 239 pages (octavo), completed on St. Matthew's Day 1839, and by permission addressed to the Bishop of Oxford, at whose suggestion it was written, in which he deals with the charge of Popery, showing its vagueness, and discusses the several points to which prominence had been given, 'whether in the Tracts or by their assailants.' The letter is very remarkable as being the first *set* defence put out by the Tract writers, and with the name of the most prominent of all. The Church, its relation to Holy Scripture; the great question of justification, so terribly misinterpreted by the popular religion, which is in fact the lineal offspring of Luther; the two great sacraments, their force and authority, regeneration the work of one, the objective presence of our Lord's Body in the other; 'the sacramental character attaching to other rites of the Church;' the necessity of an apostolically commissioned ministry; the question of celibacy—all these are discussed in Pusey's letter, and are shown to have a true and important position in any system of Catholic theology, such as our Church professes to maintain. Entirely independent of those flaws in the Roman teaching on such subjects which have driven so many souls into no less dangerous errors on the other side, it may be considered, as Dr. Liddon says, 'to rank with Pusey's happiest efforts.' Like the *Tracts for the Times*, its value is not ephemeral but permanent, and such that it would indeed be well if our younger clergy would carefully study it. In twelve months it reached a fourth edition, and was welcomed as a fair exposition of that 'Oxford' theology which was now beginning greatly to stir the minds of University men. Hook of Leeds hails it with delight; Newman thanked and hesitated, using words which showed that by this time there was a difference at least of tone of mind between him and his great coadjutor. Pusey had said, 'It is ever the tendency of novel and schismatical

teaching to develop itself further and detach itself more from the doctrines of the Church. Stationariness is a proof of adherence to some fixed and definite standard.' This he adduced as a proof of the strength of the position of the Church of England. Newman asks, 'Are you not too sanguine in saying that we are stationary?' In after years Newman referred to this as a proof of Pusey's 'confidence in his position,' while he himself was feeling that the 'Movement' was trending towards Rome, adding in the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, 'Pusey made his statement in good faith; it was his subjective view of it.' On which Dr. Liddon remarks, 'Of course Pusey might have said the same thing of his friend' (ii. 80).

Soon after the publication of this letter came great family sorrows—the loss of a child, then that of which we have already spoken, the loss of his brilliant and much-loved wife, and the ill-health of his son Philip and of his daughter Lucy, protracted till 1843, when she died. He was forced, for the sake of his children, to leave Oxford, and settle for a while at Budleigh Salterton. In the course of the journey he and his son Philip were flung off the coach at a sudden turn of the road, and considerably shaken and otherwise injured. His letters from Budleigh are full of his usual calm and hopeful tone. He finds great comfort in his children, and is occupied with the *Library of the Fathers* and the newly translated and metricized Psalter which Keble had just put out. It is remarkable to observe the care and hesitation which men like Archbishop Howley and Bishop Bagot felt at even accepting the dedication of this well-known and popular translation—whose first edition was sold in four weeks—in, may we not say it, a striking contrast to the readiness with which the flimsiest forms of prayer and services are sanctioned at the present time. They declined to give any kind of authoritative permission to the use of it in churches. One passage written at this time from Brighton may well be transcribed, as showing how much there was in Pusey of what may be called the 'Savonarola' mind; how absolutely practical was his teaching; how little need, so far as he was concerned, of the fear expressed by Mr. Elliott, of Brighton, lest he 'should introduce an extreme value of forms and rites,' to the detriment of spiritual worship and ultimately of real holiness. Writing to Newman about various treatises of Tertullian, he says—

'I hope they may help also in the crusade against pearls, gold, and costly array, which I have been in some degree engaged in; the jewels of the ladies in London would build all the churches

wanted, and endow them too, I believe. We must preach them 'into the treasury,' and silver dishes into the smelting-pot. . . . If you make Churchmen they will melt the silver dishes gladly' (ii. 120).

There is an admirable letter extant, written at this time to a lady who asked him, as it should seem deliberately, what Puseyism meant. It should be premised that he greatly objected to the word, and shrank from it when it came into common use, supplanting, no one knew exactly how and why, the word Newmanism, which some of us can still remember as facetiously changed into Newmania.

'It reminded him of the party cries at Corinth condemned by St. Paul; it contradicted that feature of the English Reformation which he was never weary of extolling that it had not been identified with any human name. . . . In his more playful moods he would sometimes speak of a man's being condemned for being an "ite," but he never pronounced the word in full.'

He answered the lady, after explaining that what is so called is rather

'a temper of mind than any peculiar doctrines; that, generally speaking, what is so designated may be reduced under the following heads:

- (1) High thoughts of the two Sacraments.
- (2) High estimate of the Episcopate as God's ordinance.
- (3) High estimate of the visible Church as the Body, wherein we are made and continue to be members of Christ.
- (4) Regard for ordinances . . . such as daily public prayers, fasts, and feasts, &c.
- (5) Regard for the visible part of devotion, such as the decoration of the house of God, which acts insensibly on the mind.
- (6) Reverence for the ancient Church, of which our own Church is looked upon as the representative to us. Reference to the ancient Church, instead of to the Reformers, as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church' (ii. 140).

Then he goes on to show, in terms most explicit and instructive, the difference between that Calvinistic system of belief which had been adopted so dangerously and widely, and that which he held as the real teaching of the Church. It is too long to extract, but it is worthy of careful study.

In another letter to Rev. J. F. Russell, the compiler of the useful work called *Hierurgia Anglicana*, he writes a warning against those Ritualistic tendencies which, in a humble way as compared with what at this time is carried on, were beginning to make themselves felt. As we have already seen, Pusey was no enemy to church decoration, but he saw plainly the beginnings of vanity and self-will.

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. LXXIV.

E E

'There seems in some practices, as the hanging of rooms with black velvet in Lent, a spirit foreign to the retiredness and absence of self . . . The very spirit of Catholicity is . . . to subdue self ; the individual should become more humble in proportion to the dignity of his office. . . . There seems to be a tendency to seek distinction by means of Church practices, which were of course a miserable profanation. . . . One should have very sad misgivings whither a person might not be led who acted with such an object as this. . . . Vanity, unsubduedness, self, in some form, has been the source of all heresy . . . I should deprecate seeking to restore the richer style of vestments used in the reign of Edward VI. . . . It seems beginning at the wrong end for the ministers to decorate their own persons. Our own plain dresses are more in keeping with the state of our Church, which is one of humiliation . . . These are not holyday times. We seem in this, as in many other respects, to have fallen involuntarily into a practice conformable to our state ; and, such as we are, in the midst of division, our flocks rent from us by the sins or neglect of our forefathers and our own, the garment of mourning were fitter for us than one of gladness . . . I cannot think that either your friends or you are adequately impressed with the responsibility of your situation. They have taken up shreds and patches of the Catholic system, without troubling themselves with its realities, its duties, its self-denial, its reverence. . . . It is tricking up an idol, and that idol, self :—not serving God. . . . For myself, I should be sorry to find myself in a richer dress until the Church were in a happier state. At present we have the surplice for a token of purity, and the scarf as the emblem of Christ's yoke' (ii. 142-5).

Would that some among us would take to heart these weighty words, which, as it seems to us, are certainly as much needed now as at any previous time !

Passing by various matters of great interest, for, in truth, there are few pages in these volumes of which this may not be said, we arrive at one of the most critical moments of these eventful years. For some time past it had been keenly realized that many minds, once set moving in the Catholic direction, were but too likely to look at Rome as the logical outcome of the whole. It cannot, indeed, be denied, as we have already said, that much of the teaching which Pusey and others called the *Via Media* differed only in degree from that of Rome. The use and advantage, for instance, of Confession and Absolution were strongly set forth, only the former was not compulsory but voluntary. So, again, the objective Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, but not Transubstantiation. Or the unity of the Church—without accepting her Roman definition ; the sacramental character of Matrimony, Holy Orders, Penance, Confirmation insisted on, but not as being of the same authority and character as those which Our

Lord Himself ordained. All this is now so heartily accepted and understood, that the danger of secession has in a great degree passed away. Men's minds are used to discern what the Church really means, and to rejoice in being able to hold 'the Faith once delivered to the Saints,' the great doctrines of the Catholic Church, without being forced, together with them, to have to endure the numerous accretions which have been added by Rome. But in the days of the later 'thirties' and early 'forties' the way was not so clear. The craving for Catholic teaching was very strong, and it was not clear to some that it could be fairly and honestly found in the Church of their Baptism. It was to reassure such that, according to Newman's explanation in the *Apologia pro Vita sua*, the famous Tract 90 was written. It was certainly a bold stroke. Considering that Rome had for years been the bugbear of the religious world in England and of what may be called the Protestant public, it is easy to imagine the indignation which would light on any attempt to show that doctrines identified in men's minds with those of Rome were not alien from a 'Confession' like the Thirty-nine Articles, which had always been held forth as the great Protestant bulwark. Looking back on those days from the vantage-ground of half a century, we now see that Newman's tone, though certainly, according to his temperament, somewhat provocative, is not only permissible, but is most according to the intention of the framers of the Articles. The excellent treatise of Bishop Forbes, who had Dr. Pusey for a 'collaborateur,' and uses the same method of explanation, has been published without a cavil. Yet those days had their merits, and it is not quite clear that the zeal, however mistaken, which conjured up the storm in 1841, is not preferable to an apathy which accepts with a contemptuous indifference some of the teaching which now emanates from University pulpits. Anyhow, there was storm enough. Perhaps it may be well here to quote Newman's own explanation, given by Dr. Liddon, taken from the *Apologia*:

'The great stumbling-block (*i.e.* to those who had begun to be uneasy about their position) lay in the Thirty-nine Articles. It was urged that here was a positive note *against* Anglicanism: Anglicanism claimed to hold that the Church of England was nothing else than a continuation in this country (as the Church of Rome might be in France or Spain) of that one Church of which in old time Athanasius and Augustine were members. But, if so, the doctrine must be the same; the doctrine of the old Church must live and speak in Anglican formularies, in the Thirty-nine Articles. Did it? Yes, it did; that is what I maintained; it did in substance, in a true sense. Man had done his worst to disfigure, to mutilate, the old Catholic Truth, but

there it was in spite of them, in the Articles still. . . . It was a matter of life and death to us to show it' (ii. 162).

The idea of such a demonstration came upon the world with startling effect. Lord Morpeth and Lord John Russell alluded to the Tract in the House of Commons, and Oxford was in arms. From Balliol, under the auspices of Mr. Tait, who, strong Liberal as he was in one direction, was quite inclined to be hard and narrow in another, emanated the famous protest of the four Tutors (or, rather 'Letter to the Editor of the Oxford Tracts,' who was not known to be Newman), the others being Wilson of Corpus, another strong Liberal and of distinctly Latitudinarian views, Griffiths of Wadham, and Churton of Brasenose. The 'Heads of Houses' next took it up, urged by a certain Mr. Golightly whose only claim to historical recognition rests on a sort of pertinacity in giving annoyance and in bringing charges against people whom the narrowness of his nature hindered him from rightly appreciating. All the suppressed indignation against the men who were, as they thought, 'turning the world upside down,' had now an opportunity, and now burst out into vigorous action. Two meetings of the Hebdomadal Council were called to deal with the matter. At the second, in spite of two earnest letters to the Vice-Chancellor from Pusey, in which he explains Newman's mind in writing the Tract, and prays the Council at least to wait for the explanation which its writer was about to publish, they put out their censure without hearing the accused in his own defence, speaking of the Tracts as 'anonymous publications, purporting to be written by members of the University, but in no way countenanced by the University itself' (ii. 175). That being the case, we cannot but remark, it is not obvious why they should consider themselves called upon to deal with them. But we can hardly realize the blindness of men who could deliberately take upon themselves to censure their three ablest and best men at that time in the University—Keble, Pusey, and Newman—while allowing, as Dr. Pusey afterwards points out, to pass without notice such publications as Hampden's *Bampton Lectures*, and other books, some denying the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration or even throwing doubt upon the Divine power of our Lord's miracles. The truth is that to advocate anything that looked like condonation of Rome, or perhaps rather the assertion of that which is now called Sacerdotalism, was in the eyes of that generation the greatest of all errors. No innocence of life, no self-denial, no power of reaching the human heart, no sincerity of purpose at all atoned for it. Nor

could the Heads be brought to see to what a condition of failure and degradation the jejune Protestantism of the day had brought the Church; how her existence depended, under God, on that revival of Catholic truth which those whom they were ostracising from University life were striving to bring about. It is not a little striking to observe the gentleness and courtesy with which the great three met this hard treatment. Newman returns thanks for 'an act which, even though founded on misapprehension, may be made profitable to myself, as it is religiously and charitably intended.' Keble considers it an objection to a counter declaration, 'that it seems setting oneself against the Heads.' Pusey writes to Copeland: 'Must we not keep strict watch over our words in this Lenten season, and see that we say not anything which seems like laughing at what the Heads of Houses are doing, or which indicates a feeling of superiority to them . . . The more jealously we keep ourselves humble the fitter it seems' (ii. 174).

But this was not all. After the pronouncement of the Heads of Houses followed that which in the eyes of men who held firmly that the Bishop was their Father in God, invested divinely with power of sword and key, was of far more importance and far more grievous—the interference of the Bishop. Bishop Bagot was in some respects the last man whom one would have selected to deal with the tremendous questions and problems which at that time were continually cropping up. He was a kindly, sensible gentleman, well-informed, but not a theologian; inclined to what before the Oxford Movement was called 'High Church,' anxious to be fair, well-disposed to the opinions of the Tract writers, at least at the beginning, and friendly towards them personally to the end. His position was difficult, harassed as he was by continual complaints in letters, some signed, some anonymous, and, of course, not wishing to set himself in opposition to the authorities of the University. His correspondence in regard to Tract 90 is mostly with Pusey, whom he seems especially to have honoured and trusted, and who, for his part, ever acted towards him with the profoundest and most dutiful respect. From his letter of March 17, 1841, it appears that he had felt for some time misgivings respecting the tone of the later Tracts. He writes then 'that it appears to him absolutely necessary that steps should be promptly taken for removing all grounds for the alarm and offence which I have reason to believe are extensively felt in the Church' (ii. 184). He would have Newman disavow certain opinions which he

believes he does not himself 'hold, nor would wish to be taught by the clergy.' He would have him adopt respectful language in speaking of the formularies of the Church, *i.e.* not call them, as he did, 'stammering lips of ambiguous formularies.' Thus he writes to Newman—

'that the object of the Tract is to make our Church more Catholic in its true sense and more united I am satisfied ; but I cannot think it free from danger. . . . I cannot refrain from expressing my anxious wish that for the peace of the Church discussions on the Articles should not be continued in the *Tracts for the Times*' (ii. 185).

Pusey, with his usual chivalrousness and faith in Newman's action, earnestly defends his friend. He tells the Bishop that very moderate men have rejoiced in the Tract ; that Newman considered that his published utterances on Rome were a sufficient guarantee for his own soundness, and made it needless for him to rehearse Rome's faults ; that his argument is directed against popular misinterpretations ; that he was opposed, contrary to the notions taken up by the four Tutors and others, to much of the authoritative as well as the received doctrine of Rome.

Newman avoids all this in his reply to the Bishop, merely assures him that the Tract was not written wantonly, and promises that there shall be no more discussions on the Articles in the *Tracts for the Times*.

Still, however, the matter lingered on. The Bishop wished Tract 90 to be suppressed, and the whole series, as soon as Keble had completed the second part of Tract 89 and Pusey had published his on the Apocrypha, to be ended. As every one knows, the Tracts did actually come to an end with Tract 90, which, however, itself lived to see its fourth edition edited by Pusey and republished in 1870. The loyalty of Pusey to his friend throughout these painful days is indeed most touching. He goes backward and forward to Cud-desdon. He writes reams of letters, all solid and argumentative ; he comforts him, endeavours to put him right with the University authorities, identifies himself with him. Yet neither Keble nor himself was quite satisfied with Tract 90. Though they heartily approved the principle on which it was written, there were various details to which they took exception. Keble, for instance, asks :

'Did not the Trent Fathers, whom Newman would exculpate from the censure of Article XXII., mean the Schoolmen's Purgatory ? And was that different from what the Homily, and therefore by implication, what the Article thought of ?' (ii. 181). 'Pusey, moreover,

represented to Newman that the Tract might be understood to imply that the Articles had no definite meaning, but might mean anything. Nor was he entirely satisfied with the language of the Tract on the Invocation of Saints.'

But, tempting as it is to quote Pusey's marvellously clear and important words illustrating the manner in which the popular mind, under pretence of abhorring superstition, had accepted irreverence and discarded great doctrines of the Primitive Church (ii. 214), we dare not linger, having still before us some of the most important passages in the story of his life. The publication of Tract 90 had in some sense made it clear that a large class of minds were looking somewhat wistfully towards Rome. A new race of men were growing up, having to the elder men—*i.e.* the reverent, thoughtful, and dutiful originators of the movement—something like the relation of the Jacobins to the Girondists; by no means inclined to be 'kept in order,' as Newman expressed it, but having strong wills, dissatisfied natures, considerable power of expression, something like contempt for all who clung to the old ways, and more *theological*, if the expression may be allowed, than like Pusey or Keble, or even Newman, self-controlling, and religious. With such as these Pusey soon had to deal; and for this his sanguine nature was rather a hindrance than a help. Newman's logic, if he could have kept his head, would have done better work. It would have met them on their own field. But they could not understand the warm affectionateness of Pusey, nor his arguments from Primitive Christianity, nor his sense of duty to the Church of England. The result was very sad. The Church party—hitherto one—lost its unity, and, saddest of all, while Pusey maintained the ground which he had occupied from the first, the difference in tone, if no more, between him and Newman was beginning to become obvious to observant minds. Thus T. E. Morris, of Christ Church, writes to Pusey in 1841:—

'I have been unable to help thinking that there was a difference so great that it must appear sooner or later. You seem to me to be agreed as to what is Christian truth (and the strange circumstances of the Church have made this a *marked* agreement), but to differ widely as to the relations in which different parties of men stand towards it, and the manner in which it may best be applied to the present state of the world. I have thought also that *while Newman did not commit himself to any of your statements on these points* (the italics are our own), you continued to speak as though you were entirely agreed with him. . . . One day I ventured to say to Ward, "I cannot help thinking that posterity will look upon Pusey and Newman as belonging to perfectly different schools. They seem to be agreed

on those points on which all Churchmen ought to be agreed, as matter of course, but no further ;" to which he replied : " I am very glad to hear you say so. I have always wondered how any one could think otherwise " (ii. 228).

The chief of the new school of thought were Ward, Oakeley, and Mark Pattison, all self-willed and lovers of paradox and great talkers. The *British Critic* was no longer in the hands of Newman. Thomas Mozley, a man whose want of seriousness and reckless fondness for a certain style of rough humour very soon carried him into worldly life, and eventually into serious heresy, was the editor, and soon articles appeared, waggish and unrefined, in a review of Professor Faussett's lecture on Tract 90, or furious and bitter as a previous article of Oakeley's on Bishop Jewell. It was pretty plain that the Movement was assuming a new aspect. Oakeley himself wrote in his article: 'We cannot stand where we are; we must go backwards or forwards, and it will surely be the latter.' He also wrote to Pusey: 'Ward knew of no theological subject on which he should venture to differ from Newman.' (He did, as a fact, as shown in his *Life*, eventually so differ from him that they were no longer on intimate terms.) At the same time, he 'would certainly *not* pledge himself not to join Rome under any circumstances, nor, from what he has heard Newman say, does he think that he would' (ii. 217). All this, as we may well suppose, was to Pusey distress, at times amounting almost to agony. Still he hoped against hope; wrote to Newman as though they were in perfect agreement; sent difficult cases of Romanizers to be dealt with by him; opened to him his whole mind and heart. Yet it must be said for Newman that he candidly told his friend that differences there were between them. 'I really do think, and always have said, that it was wisest to show that we did not agree on certain points.' The question at this time between them was the character of the Reformers. Pusey was inclined to make the best, not of the Reformation only, but of the men themselves. Newman and his followers were fiercely set against both, 'feeling that our Church cannot be right till they are exposed; till their heaven is cast out, and till the Church repents of them.' Pusey replies:

'Everyone must feel that there was a great deal of sin about the Reformation, in all the sacrilege, &c., which took place; but I have not been accustomed to consider it as being in the Reformation, as a religious act, as far as our Church is concerned, or in the part which our Bishops took; I have been accustomed to lay the sin on the State and greedy, ambitious laymen, on the sovereign, upon the in-

direct, not the direct, instruments of the Reformation ; so that as for Charles's murder the guilt rests on us as a nation, not as a Church' (ii. 227).

Of all the many troubles which for years encompassed Pusey's life, it is not too much to say that this dropping away to Rome of one after another was the greatest. Those who knew him can remember the unwearied care with which he dealt with such cases, bearing with ignorance, flippancy, and sometimes even impertinence, in his brave endeavour to keep the children of the English Church true to their natural mother. Yet troubles scarcely less trying were plentiful enough. The Bishops began to bestir themselves against the obnoxious teaching of Catholic doctrine. Bishop Sumner of Winchester followed up his refusal to ordain Mr. Young of Hursley by so severe a Charge as

'led Mr. Keble seriously to contemplate the resignation of his living. Before the end of the year Sumner of Chester, Boustead of Lichfield, Maltby of Durham, and, in 1842, Copleston of Llandaff, Pepys of Worcester, Musgrave of Hereford, Thirlwall of St. David's—even Blomfield of London, Denison of Salisbury, and his own Diocesan Bagot joined, with very varying degrees of decision, in the chorus of condemnation ; and this had more than anything else to do with precipitating the catastrophe of 1845.'

Many years afterwards Pusey said :

'What might not the Movement have been if the Bishops had understood us?' (ii. 237).

There we think that he was mistaken. The Bishops of that day understood clearly enough the difference between the teaching of Pusey and his school from those popular views in which they had been brought up, and from which they had no desire to move. It needed the experience of nearly the whole time which has elapsed since those days to open the eyes of those in authority and make them realise the weakness of popular Protestantism and the strength of Catholic principle.

In the midst of this fierce strife of tongues, the shrieks of indignation against the Tracts from Bristol and other places from men who, more often than not, had never read them, and the ribaldry and profaneness of others, Pusey writes one of his solid, well-argued letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury :

'If this goes on, my Lord, where is it to end? If our own Bishops, and others encouraged by them, say to us—sore as it is to repeat it in their own words—"Get thee hence, Satan," while those in the Roman Communion pray for us and invite us, is it

not only adding to the temptation, I say not of ourselves but of our younger brethren? . . . We wish to be merged in our Church, to be nothing but what is of all the highest—ministers and servants of our God in her, “repairers of the breach, restorers of paths to dwell in.” But if we are thus singled out from the rest of our Lord’s flock, as diseased and tainted sheep, who must be kept separate from the rest, lest we corrupt them; if a mark is thus set upon us, and we are disowned, things cannot abide thus. . . . What we fear is not generally a momentary ebullition, but rather lest the thought of seceding from our Church should gradually become familiar to people’s minds, and a series of shocks loosen their hold till they drop off, almost of themselves, from some cause, which seems in itself inadequate, because their grasp had gradually been relaxed before’ (ii. 240 *et seq.*).

At this time a project much occupied his thoughts, of which he lived to see more satisfactory and practical results than even he, in his hopefulness, could have anticipated. Both Newman and he himself had felt much the need of an outlet for the energy and devotion of those who, stirred by the example of holy men and women in the Primitive Church, desired to withdraw from the world, and give themselves altogether to prayer and to the service of God. Newman now projected what he called his *μονή* at Littlemore, and Pusey had it in mind to establish an order of deaconesses in the English Church. He went therefore to Ireland to visit the convents and to make himself acquainted with the workings of the Roman Church in a country the majority of whose population were of that religion. His biographer justly observes that it does not seem to have occurred to him ‘that the troubles consequent on Tract 90 might not be diminished by his visit at such a moment.’ As it was, this visit was much commented upon by those who saw in his every word and movement a token of Romanizing tendencies. Yet nothing could have been further from his mind. He describes the kindness with which he was met on all sides—his conversation with Archbishop Murray, whose language showed none of the supercilious arrogance which at this time marks the utterances of some of the prelates of the ‘Italian Mission,’ and a hit which he received from his former colleague at Oriel, Archbishop Whately. But there was nothing there to shake his allegiance.

‘There is nothing in Romanism to strike the eyes, except its miserable slavery to politics and sad degradation. What one sees of Romanism dispirits one. It seems as though devotion to the Blessed Virgin were to become its characteristic; and the more Catholic truth is distinctly recognized among us, the more obstinately do they hold to what is distinctive’ (ii. 245).

But it must be again repeated that it was not only a fear of Rome itself that stirred against Pusey and his friends so violent an opposition. What men hated and dreaded was the resuscitation of a system of doctrine and practice long dormant—though never absolutely defunct—in the Church of England, which separated her as a Church from the Protestant bodies on the Continent, which claimed for her a distinct and separate Faith, which invested her ministers with the name and office of Priest, which laid stress on Sacramental Grace. All then that could thwart or injure this strong and increasing school of thought was to be heartily welcomed. Most opportunely for this purpose came the proposal on the part of the King of Prussia, incited by Bunsen, for a bishopric at Jerusalem, to be supplied jointly by Prussia and England, and to ordain clergy for both nations who should minister at Jerusalem. A little consideration is enough to make it clear that such an arrangement was diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Tracts. It practically put on a level with the Church of England the so-called 'Evangelical' Prussian establishment, which stood lower even than Lutheranism. Nothing, of course, could better please the Low Church or the Latitudinarian mind. To the one it cast a slur on the Apostolical character of ordination by engaging the Bishops of the English Church to ordain ministers for a Protestant body who owned no allegiance to them, and for the other it highly favoured that general religionism which it was their object to bring about. Bunsen probably simply desired to gain for the Prussian establishment the prestige and dignity of Episcopal government, and thought that he might thus effect it, as by a side wind. Strange to say, some of the most trusted Bishops and Divines were caught by the specious notion of liberality, and the desire to widen the influence, as they imagined, of the Church, and heartily accepted the offer. Even Pusey for a while felt favourably towards it; and it was not till Newman and Dr. Mill brought out distinctly what it all implied that he joined in condemning it. This event has an historical character. We cannot forget Newman's anathema, nor the effect which it produced on his already wavering mind. 'It was one of the blows which broke me.' Pusey's acquiescence is another token of that kindly hopefulness which so often closed his eyes to what less simple but more logical natures clearly perceived. When, however, he grasped the situation, he did not hesitate to write strongly to the Archbishop:

'What an experiment! to bring together persons—one knows not

whom—sound or unsound, pious or worldly, bound together by no association, accustomed to no obedience . . . sitting when they sing their hymns, standing when they receive the Holy Eucharist, under Pastors, *consenting* to receive Episcopal Ordination, but not, as themselves contend, valuing it' (ii. 257).

Nor was this the only blow aimed at the Church party about this time by the startled and indignant world. Keble's Professorship of Poetry—during which he had given his exquisite lectures '*De Vi Medicâ Poeticâ*'—had come to an end. There was one man obviously fitted to be his successor—Isaac Williams, the devout, the learned, the Christian poet; most faithful to the Church of England, most beloved and trusted by all who were privileged to know him. But he had written a Tract, which bore, it must be owned, a suspicious name, '*Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge*.' It was absolutely misunderstood. It was simply a study on our Lord's own words, '*Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they turn again and rend you.*' It was directed against a certain over-bold and irreverent manner of dealing with great truths. It advocated no more than common-sense and discretion teach—viz. that souls should be led gradually on to higher knowledge, even as their strength and power to grasp increase. Nothing could have been farther from his intention than that of which he was accused in a letter to Mr. Roundell Palmer by the late Lord Shaftesbury—viz. of '*shunning to declare the whole counsel of God.*' Here, however, was a great opportunity for the enemy, who lost no time in availing themselves of it. The country was flooded with circulars, more or less bitter, in one of which it was said that '*the election of Mr. Williams would undoubtedly be represented as a decision of Convocation in favour of his party. . . . We think this would be a serious evil, as well as highly discreditable to the University*' (ii. 262). It is impossible to refrain from smiling as one reads these last words. The University which would not tolerate Isaac Williams could joyfully and triumphantly accept and say '*Io Pæan*' over Matthew Arnold, the avowed Agnostic. Truly, '*Tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis.*' Pusey, as usual, like Ajax of old, rushed to succour his friend. In a somewhat injudicious letter he writes, after stating the claims of Williams: '*It is a known fact that Mr. Garbett would not, even now, have been brought forward, except to prevent the election of Mr. Williams*' (ii. 263). After some hard hitting on both sides, and an offer, suggested by the Bishop, and signed by many prominent members of Convocation, to withdraw Williams, if

the other side withdrew Garbett, which they refused to do, it was agreed to count promises, the result being that Williams had 623, and Garbett 921, and was elected Professor of Poetry.

The whole air was full of trouble. In those days, which are in many respects different from those in which we live, men like Pusey made much of the voice of authority, and the fact that the University, and so many of the Bishops, had taken up so strong a line of antagonism and severity was most disheartening. The young men, too, were pressing painfully their doubts and difficulties, saying and doing rash and disloyal things; and for all this, as is shown very painfully in a letter from Mr. Churton, of Crayke, one of the staunchest of Churchmen of the old school, Pusey was made answerable.

'That which compelled me most unwillingly to forsake that entire union with you, in which I found so much comfort, has been that you seemed to treat these excesses as if they were providential indications for your guidance, and thought it a kind of "quenching the Spirit" to keep them within rule and order.'

Pusey answers gently and humbly; admits the lack of self-command and humility of some of his disciples; still looks to Newman as the sheet-anchor of the movement, and quotes two of his sermons, in which he warns

'people who have any hope that the Holy Spirit has been present with their hearts, not to forsake that Church where their Saviour's Presence is. . . . No one has any notion how much he has done to withhold people from forsaking our Church for Rome' (ii. 269, 270).

There is scarcely a year at this time, one might almost say a month, which does not bear witness to Pusey's enormous industry and activity. With all odds against him he never flinches. His heart is wrung. He is misunderstood. He makes mistakes. He sees all through his own medium of hopefulness, and is again and again disappointed, but still he holds on. 'Si fractus illabatur orbis,' it is all one to him. He believes in the Church. He sees the weaknesses, the faults, the anomalies; but he also sees the potentiality for good, and that there are at least equal difficulties in the Roman Communion. The years 1842 and 1843 were no exception. He writes another noble letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he lays great stress on two of the great evils of Rome—the denial of the Chalice, and the idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and he points out with great skill the weak points of the so-called 'Evangelical' teachings:

'Our corruption by nature, our justification by faith, were not

a summary only, but, in this meagre form, the whole substance of their teaching. Faith was made an act of the mind, taking and appropriating to itself the merits of our Blessed Lord; the rest of the Christian system, of God's gifts, the Church, the Sacraments, good works, holiness, discipline, repentance were looked upon but as subsidiary . . . if thought of any value in themselves, pernicious. To attach any value to them was to substitute the Church, or the Sacraments, or repentance, or good works for Christ' (ii. 280).

But the one great heart-wearing trouble was gradually more and more making itself felt, like some bodily ill, which at one time seems too trifling to be considered, and at length brings with it permanent maiming—loss of limb, if not of life itself. Pusey's nature was singularly warm and affectionate, open too, and unreserved almost to a fault. It was difficult to shake his confidence in those whom he loved. Intimacy was to him almost a sacred thing. To have to forgo it when once given was a complete shattering, at least for the time, of his very being. Thus we may understand those 'tears' of which Lady Lucy Pusey speaks at the time when the breach of sympathy between him and Newman began, against all his efforts to the contrary, to loom as a fact before him. Letters are now passing between them, Pusey still trusting, Newman shrinking from the trust. Pusey writing about one and another for whom he felt anxiety, as though Newman would heartily sympathize and remove any difficulty, till at last he comes to something like an inkling of the truth:

'You must not be pained at a vague sort of uncomfortableness. . . . I have doubted whether some who see you and speak of you understand you. . . . Ward's distinction between you and myself is supposed to mean more than it did, and, strange to say, to imply that you are less satisfied that our Church is a branch of the Catholic Church than myself. . . . The Roman Catholics are very busy in circulating this, . . . they give out that you and a body of others are coming over . . . I only say this because this state of suspiciousness is a painful one, and it is painful to be suspected, though you have been so long accustomed to commit your innocence to God' (ii. 292).

But Newman, writing from Littlemore, cannot accept this; is

'not at all surprised or hurt at persons being suspicious of my faith in the English Church. It would not be honest in me not to confess that I have misgivings, not about her Orders, but about the ordinary enjoyment of the privileges they confer, while she is so separate from Christendom, so tolerant of heresy' (ii. 292).

Pusey answers this by referring to the comfort and joy

which the Blessed Sacrament does actually bring to souls, even by one unconscious of its full meaning and the true doctrine, as a proof that grace may remain in the Church even though teaching is defective. Again a letter of Newman comes as a note of warning. It is to inform him that he has written to the editor of an obscure newspaper (*The Conservative Journal*) to retract the strong language which he had used respecting Rome. This, under the circumstances, distresses Pusey, and he writes accordingly; Newman replies—a little tartly—and so the correspondence continues; the one full of love and sorrow, striving to close his eyes to facts—full, too, of faith in his Church—seeing ‘manifest tokens that God is present with her,’ as in a letter to Mr. Gresley, ‘raising her from the dust, restoring her, calling her sons to more devoted service, fitting her, as a whole, for some higher office which He has in store for her’ (ii. 303).

But we must hasten onward, and limit ourselves to three great events in Pusey’s life which these volumes relate at length. First, his condemnation and suspension by the six Doctors; next, the building of St. Saviour’s, Leeds; and, last, the actual departure of Newman.

The famous sermon on the Eucharist was preached on the fourth Sunday after Easter, May 14, 1843. It fell in with a sort of series of solemn subjects which, almost unconsciously, he had made his own. He had dealt with Baptism in terms so strong that Hook had seen in his words a tendency to Novatianism, and now he was projecting thoughts of comfort, the antidote to that despair which would sink the soul to ruin in the night of unforgiven sin. The sermon was entitled ‘The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent.’ At the first moment after it was preached it seemed to produce no special astonishment. It was, of course, said ‘to contain high doctrinal views on the subject treated of; but, as all Dr. Pusey’s sermons contain high views, there was nothing to draw attention to this remark. . . . When all of a sudden, like a clap of thunder, the news came that the Board of Heresy was summoned to sit on Dr. Pusey’ (ii. 309). Then followed all those most provoking and unwise proceedings. The sermon was sent for; the court was summoned; Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor, who had taken on himself to demand the action of the Board, came, contrary to all decency, being allowed a seat as a judge, and also Pusey’s friend, Dr. Jelf; and after various meetings each brought with him, on May 27, a written judgment on the sermon. Jelf said that, ‘with much that is objectionable in tone, language, and teaching, there

is nothing tangible which can be called *dissonum* to our Church's teaching, nothing clearly *contrarium*' (ii. 317). The other five condemned the sermon. Upon this the Vice-Chancellor, Wynter of St. John's,

'proceeded to declare that he considered Dr. Pusey guilty of the charge made against him—that he had preached certain things either dissonant from, or contrary to, the doctrine of the Church of England. What these things were,' adds Dr. Liddon, 'were never publicly stated, apparently for the reason that the judges were not agreed, and that their vague hostility to the sermon would not bear discussion' (ii. 317).

As in the case of Newman, Pusey was condemned without being allowed to explain or defend himself. It was, in truth, the reverse of what the French call a *succès d'estime*. It was one of the many efforts to put down by whatever means one who had become obnoxious. The Vice-Chancellor tried to soften matters by endeavouring to persuade Pusey to recant his words. Certain passages were extracted, certain explanations or denials formulated, which he was to sign, all to be kept confidential, without recourse to external advice. The most important was to the effect that he did not 'intend to represent the Body and Blood of Christ as present with the consecrated elements by virtue of their consecration before they were received by the communicant, and independently of his faith.' This of course he could not sign. Another similar attempt was made, equally futile, when propositions were presented to him, without permission to take a copy, or even to hold the paper in his own hands. The end of all was that the Vice-Chancellor proceeded to what 'he felt to be a very severe measure, viz. suspension *a munere prædicandi intra præcinctum Universitatis per duos annos*.' The whole affair seems to us, after all that has passed since, almost too ridiculous to be believed. That these six Doctors—not one of them trained to theology, or conversant with Pusey's great mine—the Fathers of the Church—should have ventured to suspend a man of Pusey's calibre seems to us like the Lilliputians pinning Gulliver to the ground. Yet, like the Lilliputians, they succeeded in their aim. Pusey, though the legality of the sentence was more than doubtful, and certainly in these days would have been 'laughed out of court' and utterly neglected, was of too dutiful a nature to resist. He protested, indeed, 'against the sentence as unstatutable as well as unjust,' and, unlike the Doctors, he gave ample reasons for so doing. He ends his protest with these words:

'Because the sentence has been rested partly on misconstruction of my words, inferring from them what is not contained in them, partly on grounds foreign to my sermon, partly on grounds foreign to and *opposed* to our Formularies, which my judges, not myself, have contravened. I can only say,' are his concluding words in a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, 'I pray that my judges may not, in the Great Day, receive the measure which they have dealt to me' (ii. 330).

The extreme injustice of passing sentence without giving the accused the chance of defending himself stirred many hearts both in the University and outside of it. Two protests were sent to the Vice-Chancellor, one from residents, the other from non-residents, headed by such names as Courtenay, Dungannon, Gladstone, John Taylor Coleridge. The Vice-Chancellor answered the latter in a manner which drew upon him from Coleridge a well-deserved and very sharp rebuke. *Delenda est* was evidently what those worthy, but ignorant and short-sighted, men had in their minds.

More terrible to Pusey was Newman's next step—the resignation of St. Mary's. It is remarkable to observe the different manner in which all affected the two minds. In Newman it is impossible not to perceive a vein of bitterness, pardonable, indeed, under the trying circumstances, but, as we have before remarked, not betokening absolute magnanimity. With Pusey all that came to him was borne meekly, humbly, hopefully. He spoke of himself as deserving nothing less than chastisement. His spirit was purified; his faith in God and the Church never shaken. He even saw in the secessions—which at this time were sadly frequent—'its end, in humbling and purifying our Church.' In a letter to Keble, after alluding to Newman's giving up St. Mary's as a great blow, he goes on to express his mind about the unity of the Church—viz. :

'that we have a degree of unity left, though not of the highest sort, yet enough to make the Roman, Greek, and our own Church parts of the one Church, though, with holiness, unity has been impaired, and we all together suffer for it. It has come as a comfort to me that most of the marks of unity mentioned in Eph. iv. remain, and that so we may be one Body still, as having the Presence of the One Spirit. . . . The language of St. Cyprian is also a comfort, since he insists so much that what is really cut off must die; since then our present vigorous state after three hundred years shows that we have a vigorous and widening life, and are *not* cut off' (ii. 373).

Then he goes on to 'hope that, however the Reformation was caused, it has been overruled, so that our Church should be the means of some great end in acting upon the whole

Church,' which is, as is well known, De Maistre's view ; and urges that, if only we recover holiness, all will be right. Rome claiming unity as her mark lacks holiness—another mark. It was through want of holiness that the schism between East and West began. The schism at the Reformation was owing to the sins of the whole Church ; with returning holiness unity in its higher degrees will return.

It is certainly marvellous to read of the strength of will with which he hoped that, after all, Newman would retrace his steps, that still they might fight side by side. Even after that last sermon preached at Littlemore, in which occurs that most eloquent and painful apostrophe to the Church of England, so bitter yet so sweet, he held on still. Newman now betook himself to what Pusey calls the *μονή* at Littlemore—a number of contiguous cottages with rooms opening from a rough shed-like cloister, which terminated at one end by a large library filled with books ; at the other with kitchens and offices. There Pusey hoped and believed that all would go well. Letter after letter passed between them—Pusey seeing nothing but good in all that Newman said and did, having, as he says, 'such conviction that you are under God's guidance, that I look on cheerfully still, that all will be right—I mean for our poor Church and you' (ii. 381) ; Newman, greatly distressed, in that attitude of mind which, without seeing definitely the way, brings with it a pretty clear idea how all will end. It may be well here to complete the story, so sad 'all the way round,' that it reads like a Greek tragedy, of Newman's departure. There seemed a gleam of hope when Bowden, a layman, one of the writers of the *Lyra Apostolica*, after a long illness, in which he had full time to weigh, if he had them, doubts and difficulties, calmly and contentedly passed away, in the firm faith of the Church of England. Newman prayed, as he says, 'that at such time some guidance might come,' but he was left 'as dark as ever.' He writes a birthday letter to Pusey (his forty-fourth) on August 18, 1844, in which he endeavours to console him for what was all but certain to occur by rehearsing the good work done by him for souls.

'Has not Divine mercy made you the means of all this, in a way far beyond your own highest expectations? If so, is not this a fact realised, against which nothing can be put? Is it not a hundred times more certain that these things are good than that joining the Church of Rome is evil? Is it not then wrong to be downhearted?' (ii. 402).

This kindly meant, but somewhat sophistical, reasoning did not satisfy Pusey. He rejoins :

'The tendency Romewards, when I was first told it, did shatter me. I felt like one who had been left ashore and the tide sweeping by, I knew not whither, but this has for some time past away. . . . I believe implicitly all which the Church believes, hold myself opposed to nothing which I do not see, and think that any one may see further and truer than I do; although I must act on what I see myself. But what does seem impressed on me with a conviction deeper than I can say, is that God is with our Church, acting not only upon individuals, but dealing with it, if we do not forfeit it' (ii. 403).

Yet he cannot see unmoved the terrible prospect of the loss of so many whom he loved and trusted. He quotes mournfully the words 'Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved,' and speaks of the work which God seemed to have in 'store for our Church' as 'threatened.' Again Newman writes, fastening not unnaturally on these last words:

'Can a true Church become weaker while her children become better? Can a true Church lose her children, and those her better ones? . . . Surely it will be unlike the ordinary ways of Providence if her better sort of children, after years of patient waiting and steady personal improvement, and against their feelings, wishes, and interests, leave a true Church. . . . the expecting it implies so far a doubt whether this *is* a true Church' (ii. 404).

Here let it be observed that it is extremely difficult to define in any human being what 'bettering' and 'improvement' mean. There may be much that to the ordinary observer seems good and improving. And yet there may lurk unnoticed such faults as pride, impatience, hard judgment, more subtle and more dangerous than more open faults. 'Some men's sins,' says St. Paul, 'are open beforehand, going before to judgment, and some men they follow after.' Is not this, again, implied in the description of Charity, without which man is nothing? Another sad letter of explanation follows from Pusey:

'God has so wonderfully kept us together; so strangely held people back in our Communion, and then gave them contentment and growth in it, that I had ceased to have fears about it, sorrowful as are the losses from time to time which we undergo. I looked hopefully on, and trusted entirely that while our Church is what it is, and did not commit itself in a wrong direction, . . . the body of her better children would stay in her. . . . I trust so still. It would be so miserable that she should be left of those who have been God's instruments in restoring her to what she is becoming' (ii. 405).

Newman's reply at length forces on Pusey's mind that practically there is no hope to keep his friend, and he writes on August 30, 1844:

'I do not shut my eyes now. . . . But though I feel as in a vessel threatened with shipwreck, I trust that our Lord is still in her, and that however perilled, she will not perish. I seem as if the waters were gathered on heaps on either side ; yet trust that we are Israel—not Pharaoh's army—and so that they will not fall. . . . I do hope that God will not allow this to be, nor destroy His work in the midst of the years ; and so I hope, and commit things to Him. . . . I hardly know what sorrow can now reach me which does not involve the injury of single souls or of the Church' (ii. 407).

Thus matters went on ; difficulties aggravated by a very mistaken movement on Pusey's part to oppose the appointment of Dr. Symons of Wadham College as Vice-Chancellor, as a protest against heresy and heretical decisions, that is, in regard to his Suspension, which not only failed, but enlisted against the Catholic party the sympathies of no few of those who had hitherto supported it ; or, again, by the great battle about Ward's *Ideal*, when, as every one knows, the book was condemned as contrary to the teaching of the Church, and Ward himself degraded, the Proctor's veto saving the University from an attempt, inconceivable as it seems in these days, to enforce a new theological test to be imposed on all persons, lay or clerical, 'who might hereafter be suspected of unsound opinions.' Then came another attempt to revive a resolution formulated by the Heads of Houses in 1841, which condemned Tract 90, as 'evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles,' which, though four years ago certain to be rejected if brought before Convocation, might in the present state of men's minds—excited and alarmed by the movement towards Rome, and by the rash words of Ward and Oakeley—not improbably have been carried. During all this time, in spite of all Newman's efforts to describe his mental condition, the indifference which he had at last assumed to the concerns of the Church of England, his almost unconcealed satisfaction at the strong Protestant feeling which all that was going on revealed, and which more and more strengthened his growing or grown conviction that Rome was his only refuge, Pusey insisted on claiming his counsel as to both public and private concerns.

'I should not be honest,' writes Newman, 'if I did not begin by saying that I shall be glad, selfishly speaking, if this decree passes. Long indeed have I been looking for external circumstances to determine my course, and I do not wish this daylight to be withdrawn' (ii. 428). Or again to J. Miller : 'I have now no pain about these ecclesiastical movements. I am too far gone for that' (ii. 429). Or again : 'My dear Pusey, please do not disguise from yourself that, as far as such

outward matters go, I am as much gone over as if *I were already gone*. It is a matter of time only' (ii. 448).

At length, as a last resource, Pusey presses upon him 'the unsettlement of convictions and the dissension of families' consequent on his intended step. He reminds him of his own article in the *British Critic* on the 'Catholicity of the English Church.' He speaks of the tokens of Christ's Presence in the signs of growing life, and the apparent results of the action of the Sacraments in individual cases. Newman owns to his sorrow that the first of these arguments has force, but avers that these differences exist already; and, after all, if his departure is right he cannot regret that others should follow. As to the Article, it was 'written to satisfy my own mind; I never simply acquiesced in it' (ii. 450). Is not this a somewhat strange statement? So with his paper on 'Private Judgment,' and his 'Four Sermons on Antichrist.' 'I have retreated,' he says, 'and kept fighting'—a metaphor which, like many metaphors, will scarcely 'run on all fours,' when, as in Newman's case, the heart and courage failed.

'Where,' he goes on to say, 'am I to stop? What am I to believe? Each one has his own temptations. I thank God that He has shielded me morally from what intellectually might easily come on me—general scepticism. . . . I must go forward or backward, else I sink into a dead scepticism, a heartless *acedia*, into which too many, I fear, in Oxford are sinking' (ii. 450).

This, we think, is a very remarkable passage, and well worth noting. There is much more like it, but too long to quote. But it does seem to point at a kind of intuitive dread in the writer's mind of something even worse than Rome, even that terrible loss of faith such as he saw in his brother, F. W. Newman, and from which 'going forward,' as he calls it, might preserve him. He deals with the signs of growing life in the Church as so far satisfactory, but not to be opposed to what he drew from the Fathers, which made it clear that they would not consider members of the English Communion, however holy and devoted, to be *in the Church*. 'I shall resign my Fellowship in November.' He actually resigned it on October 3, 1845. After this letter, even to Pusey it seemed that no hope remained. He writes to H. A. Woodgate, still full of love to Newman:

'His dependency about our condition has been deepening since 1839; he has done all he could to keep himself where he is; but his convictions are too strong for him, and so now my only hope is that he may be an instrument to restore the Roman Church, since

our own knows not how to employ him. His energy and gifts are wasted among us. But for us it is a very dreary prospect. Besides our personal loss it is a break-up, and I suppose such a rent as our Church has never had. . . . It makes me almost indifferent to anything, as if things could not be better or worse. However, if one lives, one must do what one can to gather up the fragments that remain, and meanwhile pray for our poor Church' (ii. 452).

The truth is that Pusey's intense affection made it impossible for him to do other than not only excuse, but also uphold him, or at least find what may be called providential reasons for the step which he was about to take.

'Your case,' he says to Newman, 'if so it is to be, I look upon as a special dispensation. I suppose, of course that, if it is so, Almighty God is pleased to draw you for some office which He has for you' (ii. 458).

He even remonstrated with some who spoke strongly against the errors of Rome, as Hook, Harrison, and Manning. His correspondence with Manning, considering all that happened afterwards, is instructive.

'I only desiderate,' Pusey said, 'more love for Rome. When the battle with infidelity and rebellion comes, we must be on the same side' (ii. 454).

Manning replies :

'A tone of love such as you speak of seems to me to bind you also to speak plainly of the broad and glaring evils of the Roman system. Are you prepared to do this? If not, it seems to me that the most powerful warnings of charity forbid you to use a tone which cannot but lay asleep the consciences of many for whom, by writing and publishing, you make yourself responsible' (ii. 455).

'O si sic omnia!' It was Keble who said, after Manning's secession to Rome,

'I always feared what would become of Manning after his violent Fifth of November Sermon. Exaggerations provoke a Nemesis, and it did not surprise me so much as it grieved me to hear that he had become a Roman Catholic' (ii. 378).

At length, however, the long-drawn suspense was ended. The blow was struck. Newman was received into the Roman Church, and with him St. John, Dalgairns, Bowles, and others who had gathered round him in the Littlemore *μονή*. C. Marriott purchased it, and offered its hospitality, in his peculiarly kindly manner, to various people—to the present writer among others, who found in the deserted rooms and empty bookcases a sad but not unedifying retreat.

Great as was Pusey's grief one cannot but feel that there must have been some relief when all was over. The tremendous tension, felt evidently so much more by him than by Newman—who solaced himself in eloquent outpourings and biting reflections on those who had misused him—had become almost unendurable, and it was some comfort to be at liberty to write a long and most affecting letter in the *English Churchman* to an imaginary correspondent :

'It is an exceeding mystery that such confidence as he had once in our Church should have gone. . . . There is a jar somewhere. One cannot trust oneself to think whether his keen sensitiveness to ill was not fitted for these troubled times. What, to such dulled minds as my own, seemed as a matter of course, as something of necessity to be endured, was to him like the piercings of a sword' (ii. 460).

That is to say, Newman thought of himself: Pusey forgot himself, and was ready to endure for the Church. ' . . . Yet since God is with us, He can bring us even through this loss.' Then he falls back on that fanciful theory that Newman was called by God to put the Roman Church to rights. 'He is gone unconscious (as all great instruments of God are) what he himself is. . . . He seems then to me not so much gone from us as transplanted into another part of the Vineyard, where the full energies of his mind can be employed, which here they were not.' And so he continues; at last quoting the words of Joseph to his brethren: 'If we by our misdeeds have "sold our brother," God, we may trust, willeth thereby to preserve life' (ii. 460, 461). As a fact, Newman's cast of mind was not much more to the taste of the Roman authorities than it had been to those whom he had left. And it is, we think, not far from the truth to say that he did better and more appreciated work with us than he did with them. The Dublin University scheme, in spite of his magnificent lectures, failed in his hands. His proposal for a Roman Catholic college at Oxford was thwarted, it is said, by Manning. His vexation at the Infallibility dogma is known to everyone. Pius IX. never promoted him, except giving him the degree of D.D.

'For myself,' Pusey continues, 'I am even now far more hopeful as to our Church than at any former period—far more than when outwardly things seemed most prosperous. . . . He has not forsaken us Who, in fruits of holiness, in supernatural workings of His grace, in the deepening of devotion, in the awakening of consciences, in His own manifest acknowledgment of the power of the keys vested in the Church, shows himself more than ever present with us. It is not to immediate results that we ought to look. "The times are in His

Hands" . . . If any one thing has impressed itself upon me during these last ten years . . . it has been that the work that He has been carrying on is not with individuals but with the Church as a whole' (ii. 462).

Brave true soul! However one may regret the momentary swervings of the needle through the strain of his deep affectionateness, and through the intensity of that humility which led him to place Newman, as a religious guide, on a pedestal far above himself, one cannot but glory in the clinging power of his own Church to keep such a one as Pusey 'faithful even unto death'—for death it was to him, death for the time to all he loved and venerated, all in which his hopes were centred, all the joy of his heart.

In the course of 1844 came the death of his beloved daughter Lucy, the eldest of the three left, at the early age of fifteen. She had early in life thoroughly imbibed her father's teaching. Newman's sermons had been her spiritual food, and she had resolved to lead a life of dedication to God's service, which, in her father's ardent desire to increase the spirituality of the Church, meant to do that on which his heart was deeply set, viz., to found a religious order in the Church. She passed away at Clifton on April 22. It is impossible to imagine more exquisite words or words more full of deep Christian fortitude and faith than those in which he announces his great sorrow. In a letter to Newman he describes her end:

'I never saw anything like that smile. . . . It seemed as if she would say, "All you have longed for me is fulfilled." . . . It turned at once all sorrow into joy. . . . A few days ago this seemed to me the heaviest blow that could fall upon me; she was the one being around whom my thoughts of the future here had wound; and now I would not exchange that smile for worlds. "Heaviness has endured for the night, but joy has come in the morning." I cannot sorrow for one whom I have seen with the light as of Heaven. . . . God be thanked for His unspeakable mercy to me a sinner' (ii. 387).

At once he plunged again into his vast labours, and busied himself much with editing a translation of 'devotional works adapted from foreign writers for the use of the English Church.' There was much doubt at the time among some of his warmest supporters as to whether the step taken were altogether prudent—whether (and this was said more especially of the translation of the Breviary) it would not create in some a yearning towards Rome. It is, of course, impossible to prove a negative—to show what might not have happened if such books had not been published. But, on the whole, it

seems to us that Pusey's theory was right: that high aspirations and noble thoughts are not for one branch or portion of the Church, but meant for all. The *Imitation of Christ* and various other devotional books had long been read and loved, and from those which he added, as Avrillon's *Guide to Lent and Advent* and the *Paradise of the Christian Soul*, and others, were very carefully eliminated all passages which might disturb hesitating or untaught minds.

The last great event in Pusey's life which these volumes record is the building of the Church and founding the Parochial District of St. Saviour's, Leeds. As long ago as 1839, Dr. Hook, who was on intimate terms with Pusey, though sometimes alarmed at the course which the movement had taken, had written to represent to him the great need of churches in that huge and increasing population. He was anxious to turn the liberality of those who declined to subscribe to the Martyrs' Memorial to help in this pressing concern. The letter came to Pusey at a very solemn crisis in his life—while his wife was near her death. That tremendous loss he, in his habit of self-accusation, represented to himself as a chastisement for sin, and henceforth regarded himself as a penitent to a degree which less humble minds can hardly realize. As we saw in the history of that period, he withdrew from society, busied himself in study, meditation, prayer, service of the Church, and lived and fared as plainly as one of the saints of old. Some months after Hook's letter he replied:

'I know a person who wishes in such degree as he may . . . to make up a broken vow, in amount if not in act. It would amount to about 1,500*l.* . . . The only condition which the person wishes to annex is an inscription. "Ye who enter this holy place pray for the sinner who built it." . . . It would be a long time before it could be raised, as it must come probably out of income' (ii. 468).

Hook warmly accepted, but said in his letter that the inscription must be mentioned to the Bishop of Ripon (Longley), who 'of course would not object.' The Bishop, a man of kindly nature, but timidly alive to unconventional acts, consented, provided that the parties were living for whom the prayers were required. The original proposal for the dedication was 'Holy Cross,' the day of Pusey's baptism, which he observed for the last forty-nine years of his life. But to this the Bishop took exception, and, finally, it was agreed that the church should stand as now, with the dedication of St. Saviour. There was much correspondence, many difficulties, before all could be brought straight. Fifty years ago a

new church was looked upon with careful scrutiny, and in Leeds, abounding, as Hook says, with 'Puritans' and 'Methodists,' with 'not five people in the whole town' to sympathize with Pusey's views, with the newspapers, even the *Times*, which at first was friendly, in 'full cry' against this 'new doctrine,' it was not unnatural that Hook, courageous as for the most part he was, should feel anxiety. Every step was questioned: the inscription in the porch, as we have seen, and the dedication; the subject of the windows; the inscription on the chalice presented by Dr. Pusey's most loved daughter Lucy, and looked at and rejoiced in by her just a few hours before her death; the altar, which, after Sir Herbert Jenner Fust's weak decision, was ordered to be moveable and of wood; and at length the Bishop, contrary to his usual courtesy, actually wrote as though he had not been straightforwardly dealt with, though he had seen and returned without comment drawings and everything else connected with the church. All this was indeed hard, coming, too, at such a time of distress, while the vision of Newman's secession faced him at every moment.

'Everything,' he writes to Hook, 'that I touch seems to go wrong.' And, again: 'One's heart is quite sick with continual anxieties day after day. A feather taken off would be a relief. . . I have been anxious not to commit the Bishop, but there is nothing but discouragement; and it discourages others, too, that the wish to benefit our Church should be thus met. Even my dear child's present of a most beautiful chalice is questioned, because it has her prayer before her departure, her prayer in offering it—"Propitius esto, Domine, Luciae," &c. However, I have the deep feeling that for such as me it is only fit to have disappointment in all I do. May God forgive me and spare my work, for His Son's sake' (ii. 485).

There are some thoughtful words in a letter at this time as to the good which has been done by having the Ten Commandments in our churches as ordered by the 82nd Canon. He wrote to Mr. Benjamin Webb:

' . . . Now I suppose, many ways the use of the Ten Commandments is, and has been of great benefit to our Church. In our absence of discipline or private confession, they stand as a fence around the Holy Communion, warning people not to break in; then they suggest a detailed Catholic self-examination and detailed confession to God: they are a protest against any doctrine of justification by what people think to be their faith, or by feelings, they imply what we so much want—continued repentance' (ii. 476).

Much as we agree with Dr. Pusey as to the probable good effect of the use of the Commandments under our circum-

stances in our churches and Prayer Book, he was unaware in pleading for them as an altar-piece that it was not until the time of Sir Christopher Wren that they were ever used as an altar-piece. Till then they had always occupied the east end of the church or nave as required. The Elizabethan and later specimens of them were usually placed on the chancel-screen, as any one who lived before what is called church restoration knows. But Wren, who was guiltless of building chancels, utilized them for altar-pieces in his small apses, or recesses, where, if he had built chancels, they could never have been seen and read by the people as proposed by the Canon.

At length, after much hesitation and many delays, the day of consecration of St. Saviour's was fixed—the Feast of SS. Simon and Jude, October 28; when, just three weeks before that day, as though to complete the suspicion and difficulties, Newman joined the Church of Rome.

We know nothing more bravely, and at the same time more wisely, done than Pusey's action at this critical moment. Few people could have faced such odds.

'Hook,' writes J. B. Mozley, 'was exceedingly hearty, though very nervous beforehand and apprehensive. The Bishop, too, was dreadfully nervous, and in fact one would suppose Pusey was a lion or some beast of prey—people seem to have been so afraid of him. The Bishop was afraid of being entrapped into anything, and objected to this and to that' (ii. 493).

But what Pusey did was—little probably as he himself realized it—the act of true generalship. If he had faltered for a moment, if he had cowered before the storm, or if he had yielded to the temptation to be sentimental over Newman and the seceders, it is impossible to estimate the consequences. What he did was to open the door of the newly built and consecrated church for a week of what would now be called a Retreat for all comers. The church was filled through the whole week, mostly by clergy; 'nineteen sermons were preached besides that of the Bishop'—three on four of the days and two on the others. Of these Pusey delivered seventeen, ten written by himself, seven written by others who were unable to be present, much added to by him. The volume in which they are collected, with a striking Preface from himself, is most valuable—full of deepest spiritual teaching. Some of us can remember the thrilling effect which these sermons produced. They form a course, and carry the reader through the various stages of Penitence onward to Heaven itself. Nothing could have made a better *Apologia* for the Church of England and for Pusey himself than that Leeds week. Worn

out by care and sorrow, attacked fiercely on all sides, suspected—one can hardly, seeing all that had happened, say unfairly, or at least otherwise than naturally—he stood in the pulpit of the church which had cost him so much anxiety, asserting the one great object of his life—to serve God's Church and deepen penitence and love. Night after night during that week he hardly slept, so eager were men to take advantage of his presence and open to him their griefs. Yet that week's work was to him exactly what he needed. It gave him that confidence, not only in the Church—for that he never lost—but in himself, in his own powers, in his own call to do work for God.

'It was a very blessed time,' he writes to Keble. 'People came, day after day, to the *three* sermons (mostly), listened very earnestly, and returned home with a deepened sense of responsibility. This was expressed very affectingly. There seemed such a much deeper spirit among the clergy, a greater sense of the need of intercession' (ii. 498).

Here, then, we pause, with the feeling that it is difficult rightly to represent these remarkable volumes. Each page, each letter is full of solid matter for reflection, and it is difficult to omit any without a sense that something valuable has been passed by. This continues to the very end. The last pages contain most valuable letters to one and another on the danger and sinfulness of leaving the English Church, and a correspondence with Newman, more or less painful, though on both sides in affectionate terms, after which intercourse ceases for seven years.

The great feature, as it seems to us, in Pusey's character, which crops up in almost every letter, and in each of his many sermons, is his deep and immovable faith in God. Everything is referred to God. He looks to God throughout. In his wife's death, in his daughter's death—both of which pierced to his very soul—he comforts himself with this one great truth, the perfection of God's love and wisdom, and sees in them only causes for deeper penitence as his great and more perfect service. It is the same in all the attacks which came so violently upon him. It is the sense of God's Presence and guidance of the Church which sustains him in the long and terrible distress of Newman's doubts and final departure. This perfect faith in God was his living lodestar. It never for a moment deserted him. Then next came his faith in the Church. The keen logic of Newman no doubt—as how could it be otherwise?—troubled him, and showed him weak points in our system which he would not of his own accord have

realized ; but there was in him a grand instinct, which made him realize that, in the words of the late Dean of St. Paul's :

'The English Church was as well worth fighting for as any other. It was not only in England that light and dark, in teaching and life, were largely intermingled. We had our Sparta, a noble, if a rough and incomplete one—patiently to do our best for it was better than leaving it to its fate, in obedience to signs and reasonings which the heat of strife might well make delusive.'¹

Thus he held on, and lived to see results which if, like all human efforts, they are not devoid of blemish, nevertheless mark a life and growth which tell their own tale, and which, since the Church was formed, have never been found in the decaying branches of heresy and schism. To him we would apply, with slight alteration, the well-known line of Ennius commemorating him who saved Rome in the great crisis of her history :

'Unus qui nobis *sperando* restituit rem.'

¹ *Oxford Movement*, p. 347.

ART. IX.—ST. JOHN IN ASIA MINOR:
THE APOCALYPSE.

1. *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170.* By W. M. RAMSAY, M.A. (London, 1893.)
2. *Die Kommentare des Victorinus, Tichonius und Hieronymus zur Apokalypse.* Von Dr. J. HAUSSLEITER. (*Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben.* Leipzig, 1886.)
3. *Die lateinische Apokalypse der alten afrikanischen Kirche.* Von J. HAUSSLEITER. (Part IV. of Zahn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons.* Erlangen, 1891.)
4. *Die Johannes Apokalypse: textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung.* Von Dr. BERNHARD WEISS. (Vol. vii. part ii. of Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen.* Leipzig, 1891.)
5. *The New Testament in the Original Greek.* The text revised by B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D. and F. J. A. HORT, D.D. (Cambridge, 1881.)
6. *The Revelation of St. John: Introduction and Commentary.* By Ven. W. LEE, Archdeacon of Dublin. (In vol. iv. of the *Speaker's Commentary on the New Testament.* London, 1881.)
7. *The Revelation of St. John the Divine: with Notes and Introduction.* By the late Rev. W. H. SIMCOX. (*Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 1890.)
8. *L'Antéchrist.* Par E. RENAN. (2nd ed. Paris, 1873.)
9. *The Provinces in the Roman Empire from Cæsar to Diocletian.* By THEODOR MOMMSEN; translated by W. P. DICKSON, D.D. (London, 1886.)

THE place of Asia Minor in the early history of Christianity was the theme which, in connexion with Professor Ramsay's work on *The Church and the Empire*, we set ourselves in the July number of this Review to illustrate. By the help of the Epistles, of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the story (so far as it can be considered genuine) of Thecla, we traced the history as it is there mapped out for us of the foundation of the Christian communities by St. Paul. We showed that the new religion excited social opposition by its upheaval of traditional customs, and business opposition by the dislocation of trade, but that against serious molestation it could count confidently on the protection of Roman law. We have now

to speak of the generation of Asiatic Christians which experienced the change from this contemptuous toleration by the central government to unrelenting and unremitting persecution, and of the book in which the corresponding change of their conception of the Empire in relation to the Church is depicted by the master hand of St. John.

St. Paul's apostolic oversight of the Asiatic Churches lasted down to the latest months of his life. From his first captivity he wrote to Colossæ bidding them to expect a visit from him after his release. We know from the Pastoral Epistles that he did in fact travel eastwards again, and we hear of him in particular at Miletus and at Troas. But it was Ephesus which had been his headquarters for two years when previously settled in Asia after his second missionary journey; and Ephesus was still to be the centre of the Christian communities. There he left his representative and favourite disciple Timothy in charge; thither, at the very close of his career, when again a prisoner in Rome, he despatches Tychicus on some unnamed mission, though to do so deprives him of the companionship of almost the last of his personal attendants.

But the mantle of the work begun by the inspired insight of St. Paul was taken up, not by any one of his own disciples, but by the most illustrious survivors of the first generation of the Church. To this same district came St. John and St. Philip, possibly St. Andrew as well; it is natural to suppose that their migration was the result of the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem, which expelled Christianity from its first home and sent it out into the world to seek another. They did not stay at Antioch, nor among the communities founded by St. Paul in the interior of Asia Minor; nor did they, on the other hand, remove themselves as far from Palestine as to settle in the great Church which St. Peter and St. Paul had, if not founded, at least organized in the capital of the world; but they halted midway in the district where east and west most intimately intermingled with one another, and there they watched over the completion of the transformation of Christianity from a Jewish sect into the Catholic Church. St. Philip placed himself at Hierapolis in the valley of the Lycus, and probably gave to it an importance in Christian circles which is illustrated by its possession of two well-known names during the second century on its roll of bishops—Papias and Claudius Apollinaris. St. John, the chief of the newcomers, settled in Ephesus in the wake of his predecessor St. Paul, and abode with the disciples, as Irenæus tells us, until the

times of Trajan. There have not, indeed, been wanting scholars audacious enough to deny all reality to the tradition of St. John's residence in Asia, as there have not been wanting arguments against any fact, however well established, in early Christian history. But just as we should not waste time in demonstrating St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome, so in this parallel case we need not spend words on the proof, even though names so respectable as Keim, Scholten, and Holtzmann be ranged against us.¹

Nor is this the place to open up the question of the authenticity of all the writings attributed to St. John. The Gospel and First Epistle throw little light on the definite historical experiences of the Asiatic Churches, beyond the general impression that is conveyed of a situation more developed than in the writings of St. Paul. The position of the Second and Third Epistles is at least doubtful, and though their evidence would be no less interesting if they emanated from John the Presbyter instead of John the Apostle, their date would be less certain. The Apocalypse, on the other hand, is full of priceless historical portraiture; and the Apocalypse is attributed to St. John the Divine by the concordant voice of the earliest Christian witnesses and the extremest modern critics.

No doubt many of the most learned and competent Church writers, especially among the ancients, have rejected the claims of the book to apostolic authorship, if not to canonical rank as well. No doubt, too, even among scholars who receive it as St. John's, a wide and well-marked difference of opinion exists between those who assign it to the period after the death of Nero, *c.* A.D. 69, and those who put it a quarter of a century later, towards the end of the reign of Domitian. But none of these divergences manifested themselves among the first generation of those who received the book. During the second century a continuous catena of writers witness to the authority, the authorship, and the date of the Apocalypse. Papias is appealed to by Andrew the commentator, at the head of the 'more ancient' writers whose evidence guarantees its inspiration. Alone among the books of the New Testament it is quoted by the author's name, like the prophecies of the Old Testament, as foretelling the millenarian reign of the saints at Jerusalem, in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with the Jew Trypho.' The letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne quotes Apoc. xxii. 11 with the phrase 'that the Scripture may be fulfilled.' Irenæus alleges the testimony of

¹ Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, p. 557 sq.

personal acquaintances of St. John to the reading 666 as against 616 for the Number of the Beast, and dates the book at the end of the reign of Domitian. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the Apostle's recall from Patmos after the death of 'the tyrant.' And this, the unanimous verdict of the second century, is predominant in the third; Origen and Methodius, representatives of Egypt, Palestine, and Asia Minor, are at one with Hippolytus in Rome and Tertullian and Cyprian in Africa. On the borders of east and west, Victorinus, bishop of Petavio on the Drave, who wrote in Latin, although better acquainted, St. Jerome says, with Greek, was the author (and this implies an even more thorough acceptance) of a commentary on the book. Not inappropriately he received the crown of martyrdom under Diocletian. The power of the Beast, wounded though he had been to death, was not crushed yet; but it was just that unfaltering conviction of the future triumph of the Church over the world which permeates St. John's prophecy, that made it so precious a companion in days of external trial. No general law is more certain than that the prevalence of persecution is accompanied by an increased devotion to apocalyptic literature; where the present is so dark the future, with its recompense and retribution, with its reversal of the positions of the martyr and of the judge, becomes the all-engrossing hope. So in the time of Severus' persecution, a Christian writer named Judas, discussing the seventy weeks of Daniel, brought down his computation to the year 202 A.D. and anticipated at that moment the near approach of Antichrist, 'thus vehemently,' adds the historian, 'did the persecution directed at that time against us disturb people's minds.'¹

This somewhat disparaging comment of Eusebius on apocalyptic researches will serve to remind us that another and an opposite tendency was gathering strength, especially in the Eastern Church. At intervals during the third century—more regularly and uncompromisingly after the age of persecution closed—Hellenic culture revolted against what seemed the crude and violent imagery, the unrestrained Orientalism, of the prophecy attributed to St. John. The Fourth Gospel was, among the books universally recognized as canonical, exactly the one which showed the clearest traces of the influence of Greek thought. Was it possible then to admit that a composition so utterly alien in tone from it as the Revelation proceeded from the same pen? Gaius the Roman presbyter, the first churchman of whom we hear as declaring

¹ Eus. *H. E.* vi. 7.

against the book, ascribed it, on the ground of its promise of material rewards and an earthly kingdom, to the heretic Cerinthus.¹ Dionysius of Alexandria, a generation or two later, while on critical grounds he refuses to identify the writer of the Gospel with the writer of the Apocalypse, declines to go the length of adjudging the latter to a heretic, and finds a middle ground on which to reconcile criticism and custom in the view that the book is inspired indeed, but the work of some John other than the Apostle. The successors of Dionysius in the patriarchal see adopted, as was so often the case with them, the Western rather than the Eastern view; but Egypt excepted, the Apocalypse did not approve itself to the taste, either in culture or in politics, of the Greek Church of the fourth century. Eusebius, though his historical sense could not fail to be impressed by the early evidence of its use, obviously leans for his own part to the unfavourable view. The New Testament lists of Cyril of Jerusalem, of Gregory Nazianzen, of the Council of Laodicea, and of the Apostolic canons, are unanimous in their conspiracy of silence against the book; while in the Syriac-speaking churches not even a version of it existed until the revision of the New Testament by Thomas of Harkhel in the seventh century.

The Latins shared neither the literary sensitiveness of the Easterns nor their excessive veneration for the secular power in the hands of Christian emperors. They found nothing to grate on their prejudices in the Apocalypse, and they continued to devote to it no inconsiderable amount of study. In the sixth century, Cassiodorus (who himself was the author, among the multifarious products of his retirement at Viviers, of scholia on the Apocalypse) enumerates besides Victorinus the commentaries or treatises of Tichonius, Jerome, Augustine, Vigilius Afer, and Primasius, though Vigilius and Augustine had only treated of special points. Of these a work bearing the name of Victorinus is still extant in two not identical but closely related forms,² the substance of which is clearly ancient, and corresponds with what we know of the author's literal and historical method. But the shape can scarcely be

¹ Eus. *H. E.* iii. 28: cf. the Syriac fragments of the Heads of Hippolytus against Gaius: Dion. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii. 25.

² The one printed in De la Bigne's *Bibliotheca Patrum* (ed. 2, Paris, 1589, i. 1245-62), the other in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca* (iv. 52 sq.). Haussleiter gives the preference to the former; the latter is quoted as 'sanctus Victorinus episcopus' by the scribe of a Florentine manuscript of the tenth century or its ancestor, who has inserted the whole section on the Number of the Beast into a Donatist chronicle of A.D. 438 (*Monumenta Germaniae; Chronica Minora*, i. 194).

his, seeing that he was a chiliast, while the printed commentary explains the thousand years in an allegorical sense, and seeing, too, that an alternative explanation of the Number of the Beast is given in the name of Genseric, the Vandal persecutor of the fifth century. Part of this difficulty may be solved with Haussleiter, who has noticed that an epistle bearing the name of Jerome, and prefixed to the text in De la Bigne's edition, implies that the writer had revised and rewritten the commentary of Victorinus on all doubtful points, especially that of his chiliasm, by the help of 'the works of our predecessors.' The whole proceeding would be quite characteristic of Jerome's methods; but even Jerome cannot have spoken of Genseric, nor is it quite clear that he could have applied the phrase *maiorum libri* to the only commentator (other than Victorinus himself) of sufficiently early date to come into question, Tichonius the Donatist. Of this scholar's history we only know that he preceded St. Augustine (*De Doct. Christ.* iii. 30), and that his dissent from the violence of his fellow-schismatics on the question of excommunicating the rest of the Christian world provoked an attack from Parmenian, Donatist bishop of Carthage c. A.D. 350-392, which in turn was answered some years later in the *Contra Parmenianum* of Augustine. Tichonius's system of exegesis, unlike that of Victorinus, was, we are told, allegorical and spiritual. His work has perished; but large portions of it are shown by Haussleiter to have been incorporated by later commentators—a speaking testimony to its reputation and value. Thus another African, Primasius, Catholic bishop of Hadrumetum two centuries later,¹ stigmatizes the exegesis of the Donatist writer as containing 'many things that are unsound, foolish, and superfluous,' but acknowledges nevertheless that he has himself rescued 'pearls from the dunghheap:' *unde-cumque veritas clareat catholicæ defendenda est unitati*. Even to the eighth-century commentators Tichonius was still a standard writer. Bede names him, though only, it is true, to record his disagreement from him; while a younger contemporary of Bede's, the Spaniard Beatus, has silently embodied without protest or remark much that only becomes intelligible when we see in it Tichonius's defence of the separation of his sect from the Catholic body.

'As in the Babylonian captivity, so now heretical priests carry off our vessels. They take for themselves the name of Christ, the

¹ For the life and history of Primasius see Haussleiter, *Die lateinische Apokalypse*.

Law, the Gospel, the Epistle, the Psalms, Baptism, the Amen and the Alleluia, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.¹

If this is the passionate outburst of a Donatist, we are reminded in the words that immediately follow, 'we do not repeat Baptism,' of Tichonius's independent protest against the prevailing Donatist views;² and the same explanation must be given when the writer urges that if Philadelphia of old time or Africa in his own day had 'kept the word of God's patience,' it was not to be thought that the Philadelphians then or the Africans (that is, the Donatists) now were the only Christians in the world.³

Meanwhile in the East the two only commentaries produced before the year 1000 A.D. are those of the two archbishops of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, Andrew and Arethas, of whom the former would appear to have lived about the end of the fifth century, while the date of the latter is fixed by the subscription to the great Paris manuscript of the Greek Apologists, written by Arethas' notary Baanes in A.D. 914. From this it is a natural inference, and one borne out by the facts, that the text of the Greek original of the Apocalypse is less securely based than that of any other portion of the New Testament. Where the book was in less request, the manuscripts also were fewer. Of uncials there are extant only five;⁴ of later or minuscule manuscripts a considerable number are of course now known, but so scanty were copies in the West in the time of Erasmus that that scholar constructed his *editio*

¹ P. 55 of the only edition, that by the Augustinian, H. Florez, Madrid, 1770. According to Haussleiter, copies of this book are as rare as manuscripts; the present writer has seen in the Bodleian a presentation copy from the author, 'celeberrimæ Universitati Oxoniensi.'

² As St. Cyprian rebaptized schismatics, so the Donatists, following his example and considering the Catholics as in schism, refused, most of them at least, to recognize Catholic baptism as valid.

³ *Ibid.* p. 212. Haussleiter also thinks that in the 'Summa dicendorum,' prefixed by Beatus to his commentary, he can identify the (otherwise unknown) work of St. Jerome on the Apocalypse, mentioned by both Cassiodorus and Beatus himself; but this seems to us highly problematical.

⁴ Three of these form part of manuscripts which contained the whole Bible, the Sinaitic (A), the Alexandrine (B), and the imperfect Paris palimpsest (C); the fourth of the great Bibles, the Vatican MS. (D), breaks off abruptly in its present form in the middle of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it is therefore impossible to say whether the Apocalypse was originally contained in it. Besides these three, we have another Vatican MS. of the end of the eighth century—called also B by Tischendorf, and B₂ by Westcott and Hort, but by Tregelles and Weiss, to distinguish it more readily from its great compeer, Q—from the library of the Basilian monks, and the somewhat later P, brought to St. Petersburg by the Russian bishop Porphyry.

princeps of this part of the New Testament on a single manuscript of the twelfth century,¹ and filled up its *lacunæ* by himself retranslating the Latin Vulgate into Greek. And the Apocalypse manuscripts are not only less numerous, they are also less trustworthy. It was the early recognition of the New Testament books as authoritative and inspired, which conditioned the independence of the copyist. But this reverence for the sacredness of the text we have seen to be a motive which in regard to the Apocalypse would have been, during the third and fourth centuries, largely inoperative in the East; and in consequence a vast diversity of readings grew up which is elsewhere in the New Testament without parallel. The Sinaitic MS., for instance, is the second in age and, according to Westcott and Hort, the second in general trustworthiness among our Bible manuscripts; but the ancestry of its text in the Apocalypse stands so far apart from the rest that it contains in this book no less than five hundred readings entirely peculiar to itself.²

So much, then, being premised as to the history of the Apocalypse in later Christian generations, we turn to the book itself and to the circumstances of its composition, and inquire what light it throws on the contemporary conditions of the Church, and especially of the Church of Asia Minor.

‘The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.’ St. John was in Patmos, the scene and occasion of his prophecy, for the word of God and testimony of Jesus Christ. For the same word and witness those who cried from beneath the altar, those who should reign for the thousand years, had been beheaded and had been slain.³ Like them, St. John was a martyr, and for his confession he was sent to the island; but on the circumstances of his arrest and condemnation, or on the nature of the sentence, he is wholly silent. Tertullian places his banishment in direct connexion with the story that he was plunged into boiling oil at Rome and suffered no hurt.⁴ This legend of ‘St. John before the Latin gate’ is primarily of interest in so far as it confirms the presumption that the Apostle had himself, following in the footsteps of St. Peter and St.

¹ Erasmus’ manuscript had disappeared in modern times till it was discovered at Mayhingen in 1861. It is now numbered 1 among the cursive manuscripts.

² Dr. Hort notices (p. 260) that the Epistle of Barnabas, which follows the Apocalypse in the Sinaitic MS., also contains a large proportion of ‘individualisms’ of the scribe.

³ Apoc. xix. 10, i. 2, 9, vi. 9, xx. 4.

⁴ Tert. *Præsc. Her.* 36.

Paul, travelled westwards to the capital of the world.¹ But if so, it was with nothing like the affectionate longing with which St. Paul looked forward to seeing Rome that St. John looked back on it. To him the great city on her seven hills is only the mysterious harlot, mistress of the kings of the earth, throned over peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues, full of all abominations and uncleanness, drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs, decked with purple and scarlet and gold and jewels and pearls, for whose adornment the merchants and sailors hastened from all parts with their trade in linen and silk, in precious woods and ivory and marble, in spices and frankincense, in corn and wine and oil, in cattle and horses and chariots and slaves, yes, and souls of men, until the day when God should visit her with sudden judgment.² It is difficult not to think that the seer himself had been an eye-witness of the luxury and shamelessness of the imperial city, and if so it was probably at Rome that he was tried and thence that he was sent to Patmos. St. Victorinus, full of the associations of his own times, speaks of the Apostle as condemned to the mines, and no doubt in the later persecutions at least this was a quite ordinary punishment. Thus Marcia, the concubine of Commodus, procured the release of all the Christians working in the Sardinian mines, among whom was Callistus, afterwards pope; and St. Cyprian's seventy-sixth epistle is directed to a body of African Christians, including nine bishops, condemned to the mines under Valerian; while Christians sent to the mines in Palestine and Cilicia (many of them having come from Egypt) are mentioned frequently in Eusebius' account of the great tenth persecution.³ But there were not, so far as we know, mines or quarries in Patmos, as at Naxos and Paros; and banishment to the small islands of the Mediterranean, and especially of the Ægean, was an habitual feature in the imperial policy of the first century after Christ. In old Greek times the islands had competed for a place in history on equal terms with the cities of the mainland; to the Romans, with their horror of the sea, an island, even if not one of the smallest or most barren, was a place of residence conceivable only under compulsion. Not only 'tiny Gyara,'

¹ Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, pp. 27, 198.

² Apoc. xvii. 3-6, 9, 15, 18; xviii. 11-13.

³ Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Her.* ix. 12. Cyprian, *Epp.* lxxvi-lxxix: since the addressees of Ep. lxxvi answer in three separate groups, it would appear that they were working either in separate mines or at any rate in separate gangs. Eusebius *Mart. Pal.* 7, 8, 9: among the Egyptian martyrs sent to the Palestinian mines was Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis and author of the Meletian schism. Epiphanius, *Her.* lxxix.

but Cythnos, Seriphos, Amorgos, islets as big as Patmos, as well as the larger Andros, Naxos, Lesbos, Cos, are all known to have received exiles, and Renan's objection that Patmos must have had too much commercial importance to serve as a place of banishment is hardly tenable.¹ If now we ask whether the conditions of the case point rather to Nero or to Domitian, the answer is scarcely doubtful. The persecution of Nero, as described to us by Tacitus, was a sudden outbreak in which Christians were made the scapegoats of the popular indignation, and the 'vast multitude' arrested were no sooner convicted than they perished under every refinement of sport and cruelty. The measures of Domitian were more continuous, more graduated, more varied, more widespread; it was characteristic of him to strike hard at wealth and birth, position and power. The grandsons of St. Jude were summoned from Palestine to the emperor's presence, but were dismissed unharmed, while Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Domitian and his nearest male relative, was put to death. On the same charge of Christianity many others were condemned, some to death, some to degradation and loss of property. Domitilla, the wife of Clemens and own niece of Domitian, was banished to one of the islands of the Tyrrhenian Sea. St. John may well have been one of the obscure and so far more fortunate victims of that reign of terror when, in the historian's epigrammatic summary, 'plenum exsiliis mare, infecti cædibus scopuli.'²

From this island exile the Apostle turns to the churches of the Asiatic mainland from which he had been torn away. 'The seven churches which are in Asia' are, according to the consistent use of the symbolism of numbers in the Apocalypse, a type of completeness. While the churches addressed by St. Ignatius in the next generation are those of the cities where he stayed, like Philadelphia and Smyrna, or by whose ambassadors he had been visited, such as Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, St. John's choice, not being thus conditioned, is determined by geographical, political, and civil qualifications. The chief towns of a province were the *conventus*, the centres where the governors from time to time held courts of assize, and in the province of Asia thirteen towns appear to have possessed this privilege at the close of the

¹ Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, p. 373. Contrast Mayor's admirably full note on Juvenal, i. 73: Mommsen, *Roman Provinces*, E. T., i. 343.

² Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44, *Hist.* i. 2; Dio Cass. *Hist.* lxxvii. 14; Hegesippus, *ap. Eus. H. E.* iii. 20. Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. i. ch. ii. *passim*.

first century after Christ ; but some of them, such as Cyzicus in the north, or the group consisting of Apamea, Eumenia, Synnada, and Philomelium in the interior, were far removed from St. John's ken at Ephesus. The great cities of his own neighbourhood were, near the coast, Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamus, the three claimants to the title of 'first city of Asia,' and on a more or less parallel line inland, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea.

Among these rivals, Ephesus, where the proconsul on his arrival from Italy was obliged to enter on his office, was at this time from its commerce and importance the practical capital of the province, and the natural centre for the over-seership exercised by St. Paul and St. John over the churches of the Asiatic district. The angel of this church is therefore the first addressed, and perhaps the introductory phrase 'He that walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks' is an allusion to this primacy. The Ephesians are commended for the 'unwearied' devotion to 'weary' toil of their efforts to extend the Kingdom of Christ ; for their 'patience,' which in the Apocalypse always means the endurance of present tribulation in view of the future reversal of earthly judgments ; and because, while they could bear for the Name's sake, they could not bear sin and heresy,¹ as represented in the persons of false apostles and of the Nicolaitans of whom more is told us in the Epistle to Pergamus. An argument for an early date has been drawn from this allusion to 'false apostles' ;² but (not to mention the care of the later gnostics to claim secret channels of connection with the Apostles) the *Didaché* shows us that apostles and their counterfeits played no inconsiderable part in many Christian communities under the Flavian emperors. One other point rather suggests the time of Domitian. This church, active, enduring, orthodox as it was, had lost its first love, its first works, the early enthusiasm of the days of St. Paul and of the days, perhaps, too, when St. John had first known it. The candlestick should be moved from its place 'except she repent.' The primacy of Asia still belonged to Ephesus, perhaps under Polycrates at the end of the second century, certainly under the Christian empire when Memnon of Ephesus steadfastly upheld the

¹ Apoc. ii. 1-6 : notice verse 2, τὸν κόπον, verse 3, οὐ κεκοιτάκης : verses 2 and 3, τὴν ὑπομονήν, ὑπομονήν ἔχεις, cf. i. 9, xiii. 10, xiv. 12 : verses 2 and 3, οὐ δύνη βασιδεῖσαι, ἐβάστασας.

² Thus Renan, who interprets (of course) the 'false apostles' as an allusion to St. Paul, inclines to the supposition that the writer believed St. Paul to be still alive—a view which on any date of the Apocalypse contradicts all the evidence (*L'Antéchrist*, p. 199).

faith at the Ecumenical Council held in his own city; but in later days the home of St. Paul and St. John has become a desolate and deserted village, and the primacy has passed to the sister church of Smyrna, which already under Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, gave promise of that faith and crown which the seer now proceeds to predict for it.

The keynote for Smyrna is the contrast between poverty and the true riches, between tribulation and final victory, between death and eternal life. The message comes from Him who was Himself dead and came to life again, and foretells imprisonment and martyrdom during a tribulation of ten days—a period which seems best interpreted as short and yet in a sense complete. No other church receives so clear an intimation of future persecution; and (whether or no he were already at this date 'angel' or bishop of the church) it is natural to notice a correspondence to the prediction in the martyrdom under Antoninus Pius of St. Polycarp, the most illustrious victim of any of the persecutions in the Asiatic province. On that occasion, as also a century later at the death of St. Pionius, we are told that the Jews were especially eager in forwarding the preparations for the martyrdom; and it is possible that 'the blasphemy of those which say they are Jews and are not'—which was the special trial of the Church of Smyrna, corresponding to 'the deceptions of those which say they are apostles and are not' at Ephesus—proceeded from genuine Jews. Yet it may be doubted whether the phrase, used also in the Epistle to Philadelphia, does not rather point to some Judæo-gnostic sect whose claim to be Jews was as false as that of the Ephesian heretics to be apostles. Did then these self-styled Jews and self-styled apostles represent the same or separate lines of error? The parallel of the Ignatian epistles is suggestive. St. Ignatius attacks Docetic tendencies at Smyrna and Judaic tendencies at Philadelphia, which yet appear to have been only co-existent elements in a single heresy; and if it is a similar combination which St. John contests on one side at Smyrna and Philadelphia, on the other at Ephesus and Pergamus, then the date nearer St. Ignatius is again the more probable.

In the last-named church, which is the third addressed, the Nicolaitans of Ephesus are further defined, by the parallel of Balaam, as teaching the lawfulness of fornication and of eating things offered to idols. We have here incontestably evidences of gnostic theory and practice, which, starting from the essential evil of matter, ended, at least in some cases, in declaring that all that was done in the flesh was of entire

indifference to the real man. Thus Basilides taught that it was no matter to taste of idol meats, or recklessly to deny the faith under persecution,¹ and the same principle could readily cover moral lapses as well. The Nicolaitans, then, whatever their exact origin and history—and there seems to be little or no trustworthy evidence about them apart from this book—held a spurious Christianity which counterfeited the true, and embodied just that spirit of compromise with the world and the flesh which is at the opposite pole to the standpoint of the Apocalypse.² The sect was not unrepresented at Pergamus; and the Apostle sees in its subtle influence a greater danger than the more obvious temptation to deny the faith at the hands of heathen persecutors in this city 'where Satan dwelt.' Of the direct and systematic worship of the emperor, which to every Jew, and not least to the seer of the Apocalypse, was the specially Satanic wickedness of Paganism, the earliest seat and 'throne' in Proconsular Asia was the Temple of Rome and Augustus at Pergamus.³ It may have been for some protest occasioned by the manifestations of this devotion that Antipas was here put to death—the only Christian martyrdom in Asia definitely alluded to in the book. To Pergamus, too, belongs one of the rare records of the martyrs of the next century, the Acts of Carpus, Papyrus, and Agathonice.

One of these martyrs, Papyrus, came from Thyatira; and the connexion thus suggested is borne out not only by the juxtaposition of the two churches in the Apocalypse, but by the character of the two epistles. Thyatira, like Pergamus, displayed steadfastness, faith, patience under persecution; like Pergamus, again, it suffered the same antinomian tendencies to exist, and that without protest. But at Thyatira the evil influence was concentrated in one personality, the woman Jezebel. It has been thought that she was actually the bishop's wife; and even if the reading which implies this view is incorrect,⁴ and she held no position quite so prominent, some connexion with the Christian community seems to underlie the account. On this ground then we reserve

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 7, quoting from the early writer, Agrippa Castor.

² It is impossible to say whether Victorinus (if it really be he) had any historical grounds for his milder interpretation of the Nicolaitan practices; 'ut delibatum exorcizaretur et manducari posset et ut quicumque fornicatus esset octavo die pacem acciperet.'

³ Dio Cass. li. 20, 7, quoted in Rushforth, *Latin Historical Inscriptions*, p. 48; see also Ramsay, p. 297 n.

⁴ *τὴν γυναῖκα σου* instead of *τὴν γυναῖκα*. Both readings have good early authority.

assent to the ingenious view lately re-stated by Schürer that she was a sort of sibyl whose trade was to give oracles in answer to applicants at her shrine. A Thyatiran inscription, which may perhaps date somewhere about the time of Hadrian, speaks of a 'Sambatheum,' and of 'the enclosure of the Chaldæan,'¹ and the preface to the Sibylline oracles (which is, however, attributed to the fifth or sixth century after Christ) speaks of the Chaldæan Sibyl as being named Sambethe, daughter of Noah, so that it is conceivable that such a person might typify the same sort of admixture of Jewish, Christian, and Pagan elements which we have conjectured to be the case with the Nicolaitans, and therefore with their representative at Thyatira. St. Victorinus sees in the Thyatirans the class of men who are prone to restore communion against the rules of the Church, *and to listen to new prophecies*; and the latter point certainly finds an apparently 'undesigned' coincidence in the curious information given us by Epiphanius from the sect called 'Alogi,'² who attacked the accuracy of the Apocalypse on the ground that in their day (c. 170 A.D.) there was no church at Thyatira, where the whole body of Christians had turned Montanist, the prophecies of Priscilla and Maximilla having proved as attractive to them as those of the Apocalyptic Jezebel to their predecessors.

In the message to the Church of Sardis for the first time the praise is overshadowed by the blame. It had begun well, but its completion was unequal to its commencement, its works were not 'fulfilled,' it lived only on its reputation; there were still a few, but only a few, names in Sardis who had not defiled their robes and been unfaithful to their Christian calling. Such an one in the next generation was the illustrious Bishop Melito, the greatest theologian and writer among the Asiatic school of St. John, who, 'after a life lived entirely in the Holy Spirit, lies in Sardis awaiting the coming from heaven of the Bishop of our souls and the resurrection from the dead.'³ But after Melito the history of the church of this ancient city becomes a blank.

The description of the Church of Philadelphia presents

¹ Schürer, *Die Prophetin Isabel in Thyatira* (one of a collection of essays lately dedicated to Weizsäcker on his seventieth birthday); the words are: *Θάβιος Ζώσιμος κατασκευάσας σπορὸν ἔθετο ἐπὶ τόπον καθαροῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως πρὸς τῷ Σαμβαθείῳ ἐν τῷ Χαλδαίου περιβόλῳ, κ.τ.λ.* (C. I. G. 3509). We have met with the same view in Miss Yonge's admirable *Pupils of St. John the Divine* (p. 88), who, however, makes the prophetess to have been originally a Christian. Stated thus, the theory escapes the objection we have brought against it.

² Epiph. *Har.* 51, 33.

³ Polycrates of Ephesus, ap. Eus. *H.E.* v. 24.

some remarkable points of contact with that of the Church of Smyrna. Here, as there, is the same prophecy of coming persecution (and we remember that among the companion martyrs of the great Bishop of Smyrna some at least were 'they of Philadelphia'),¹ and the same or even greater emphasis on the opposition of the Judaizing 'synagogue of Satan,' of the persistency of whose false teaching St. Ignatius' letter to this church bears ample witness. But the time was one day to come when these spurious Jews should come and worship at the feet of the glorious Church of Philadelphia on whose brow was written the name of that city of God, the New Jerusalem, which was the true successor of the destroyed earthly sanctuary of the older covenant. The same manifold use of its 'little power' in 'keeping the word of God's patience' distinguished Philadelphia in later history. Of all the Christian cities of Asia Minor it longest resisted the Mahometan conquerors, and only surrendered itself into their hands when its Christian suzerain, the Emperor John V., submitted to the degradation of consenting to appear in person among the besieging army of the Ottomans.

Laodicea, the last of the seven churches, receives the only message in which blame is unrelieved by any praise. It was possible still that some might open their doors to the knocking of the messenger and welcome his entrance. But the nakedness of the community as a whole is unrelieved by any notice that even a few, as at Sardis, were walking worthily in the white garments of holiness. Nominally they were Christians, and so could not claim the more lenient judgment of those who had never entered into baptismal privileges and responsibilities; practically, other thoughts and interests elbowed out their Christianity altogether. Material wealth went side by side with spiritual poverty at Laodicea, as material poverty with spiritual wealth at Smyrna. Laodicea is the only Asiatic city in whose case the Roman historian, after recording the calamity of an earthquake, adds that it repaired the ruin without falling back upon the resources of the State;² and the Christians apparently enjoyed their full share of this prosperity. Victorinus, perhaps rightly, emphasizes a further trait; these Laodiceans are

'rich men who read the Scriptures in their chambers, but leave their religion at home, and out of doors nobody knows what they are, for

¹ *Mart. Pol.* c. 19.

² *Tac. Ann.* xiv. 27 (A.D. 60), 'Laodicea tremore terræ prolapsa nullo a nobis remedio propriis opibus revaluit,' quoted by Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 43.

they
rather
But
they
bene
shou

Ren
the
the
crea
John
he
'An
ther
and
true

doul
the
aggr
the
goni
'fait
pseu
rigo
socia
are
with
outb
Ther
men
we s
com
if w
befo
that
coul
Chur

diab
Emp

1
2
(iii. 10
3
διδάχ

they boast of universal knowledge, and occupy themselves in books rather than in works—neither cold nor hot, but all things to all men. But just as this gift of knowledge is dangerous when misused, so if they who possess it carry it out into good works, they are 'of special benefit to many, and to them is promised the special reward that they should sit upon the judge's throne.'¹

Remembering the neighbourhood of Laodicea to Colossæ, the church to which St. Paul taught Christ, the first-born of creation, as the satisfaction of all intellectual yearning, St. John will seem to us to have the same thought in mind when he delivers the message to the Laodiceans as from the 'Amen, the Beginning of the creation of God,' who counsels them to purchase not only the gold of trial patiently endured, and the white garments of good works, but the eye-salve of true enlightenment as well.

A review of the data of these two chapters brings out the double nature, material and spiritual, of the danger to which the Asiatic Churches were exposed. On the one side is aggressive enmity, now the normal and systematic relation of the State to the Church, over against which is set in antagonism the characteristic Christian virtue of 'patience' or 'faithfulness.'² On the other side are the seductions of the pseudo-Jews and pseudo-apostles, and the relaxation of the rigour of the Christian standard of life to accommodate it to social and political exigencies. Both of these phenomena are reconciled more easily with the epoch of Domitian than with an earlier generation. Whatever the savagery of Nero's outbreak, it was not a symptom of law but of caprice. There was no room before A.D. 70 for the growth and development of so extreme a tension as is implied both here and, as we shall see, more clearly later on in the book. Again, the accommodating theory on idol meats and on fornication implies, if we are right in our interpretation of it, some lapse of time before a situation would grow up in which it would be natural that theses so alien to the spirit of apostolic Christianity could be maintained authoritatively³ as a *modus vivendi* for Church and world.

Both perils are treated by St. John as manifestations of diabolic enmity. The worship of power incarnate in the Emperor makes Pergamus the 'throne' and dwelling-place of

¹ De la Bigne, p. 1248; cf. Gallandi, p. 54.

² 'Patience' at Ephesus (Apoc. ii. 2), Thyatira (ii. 19), Philadelphia (iii. 10); 'faith' at Smyrna (ii. 10), Pergamus (ii. 13).

³ They are described not only as works, *ἔργα* (Apoc. ii. 6), but as *διδασχῆ*, doctrine (ii. 15).

Satan, just as 'Satan's synagogue' is that of the false Judaizers, and 'Satan's deep things' form the knowledge of the heretics.¹ When, then, we find in the visions which form the latter part of the book that the devil has two chief ministers on earth, with whom he is in the end cast into eternal fire, we recognize in them embodiments of the same two tendencies which the seer has traced at work in his own time.² That the Beast who fills the foreground of chapters xi.-xx. is the Roman monarch and monarchy, the brute force of the world in its contest with the Church, will become abundantly clear as we proceed. And what is the second Beast or False Prophet but the prostitution of mental and spiritual power to the aid of the world's rebellion against God? Unlike the first Beast, the second arises, not out of the sea, but out of the land; he possesses, not the strength of the West, but the subtlety of the East. He has two horns like the Lamb and speaks as the Dragon, because he comes in the guise of a follower of Christ and yet speaks blasphemies. He acts as minister of the world-power, and employs all his talents and influence to induce the peoples of the earth to subject themselves as he has done. In counterfeit of Christ's true representatives and witnesses, he has (like Simon Magus) the power of working miracles and signs, and the crowning achievement of his superhuman gifts is to make the image of the Beast a living and speaking reality to his subjects. All his energies are devoted to the task of making every man, small and great, rich and poor, slave and free, a worshipper of the Beast. Against recusants he employs, not only the rough and ready means of direct persecution, but the subtler and more deadly methods of social exclusion; no man could buy or sell save he who had the mark upon his forehead.³ Here, surely, reappear the lineaments with the outline of which the Apostle has made us already familiar at Ephesus, Pergamum, and Thyatira. There is the same mask of Christianity, the same successful deceit by spiritual manifestations, the same knowledge of the depths of Satan, the same readiness to come to terms with the world. But in the prophecy the detail is filled in with all conceivable extremes. It was apparently no single figure that St. John had exclusively in view; no apostate minister of

¹ Apoc. ii. 13, 9, 24.² *Ibid.* xx. 10; cf. xvi. 13.³ Apoc. xiii. 11-17. For the last point compare the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, ap. Eus. *H. E.*, v. 1: God's servants were not only kept out from houses, baths, market-place, but 'it was forbidden that anyone of us should show ourselves anywhere at all.' The idea of the *χάραγμα* is presumably taken from the references to emperor-worship on the coinage: so Renan and Mommsen.

the Emperor, no Simon Magus or Cerinthus among heretics, satisfies all the conditions. The inspired prescience of the seer pictures the result when the supremest powers of mind and soul are dedicated wholly and unreservedly to the service of force.

The Epistles to the Seven Churches in chapters ii. and iii. are followed by a series of visions which occupy the rest of the book. How far these are conditioned by the data of the history of the Apostle personally, and of the churches under his care, we have now accumulated enough material to judge. To deal with all the other influences which have left their mark upon the imagery of the Apocalypse would be a task beyond our limits. The rainbow about the Throne, the sea of glass mingled with fire, the sound of many waters, the prominence of mountain, island, and sea, may be traced to the picture which unfolded itself day by day before the eyes of the seer in his exile home. Much of the description of catastrophes and plagues may be coloured by the reminiscence of events familiar to the writer's generation. The awful eruption of Vesuvius, with the destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum, must have been fresh in his recollection; and the volcanic fires of Thera, which had thrown up new islands within the previous half-century, may have been visible from the heights of Patmos. But our object in the rest of this paper is to confine ourselves to an examination of the Apostle's conception of the political and ecclesiastical events of his generation, and of their bearing upon the future of the Church.

It is mainly in the central chapters that the historical value of the Apocalypse—apart from the Letters to the Seven Churches—is concentrated. From the fourth to the tenth chapter, and from the twentieth to the close, the movement of the drama takes place either in heaven or in the remoter future, the consummation of all things, upon earth. Thus the visions open in chapter iv. with a hymn of praise to God from all creation summed up in the Living Creatures and the Elders. It was natural for succeeding generations to see in the Four a symbol of the Evangelists; but it can, of course, scarcely be supposed that any such idea was present to St. John's mind, and indeed so definite an allusion to the Christian revelation would be quite out of place in this chapter. They rather represent creation as a whole, and the Elders mankind in particular, the number twenty-four—the double of twelve—signifying the whole course of human history under both dispensations. Of the two views embodied in the present form of Victorinus' commentary, the truer one will then be that

which arrives at twenty-four as the sum of the Patriarchs and the Apostles; the alternative interpretation, of the twenty-four books of the Old Testament, is a natural correlative of the erroneous interpretation of the Four Creatures as the Gospels. In this chapter the hymn is directed only to Him that sitteth upon the Throne; in the next follows the introduction of the Lamb, and to Him is paid homage for His redemption of men, not by the redeemed themselves, but by their heavenly representatives.¹ Only in the universal chorus of praise 'to Him that sitteth upon the Throne and to the Lamb,' which connects together the themes of these two chapters, is mention made of earth.

Hitherto the action has been solely in heaven; with the opening of the seals, in vi. 1, it passes down towards earth, and from this point moves backwards and forwards from one to the other, or rather includes them both with the intervening space of mid-heaven² in one survey. As each of the first four seals is opened, one of the Living Creatures thunders out the command 'Come,' and four horsemen, on horses white, red, black, and pale, in turn appear. Here, if our exegesis is correct, we have the first indication of St. John's conceptions of the contemporary history of the world independently of its relations to the Church. The first rider has a white horse, and, armed with a bow, goes forth to conquer; the second is mounted on a red horse, and wields a sword, with which he encourages war and internecine bloodshed.³ Even if this passage stood alone, the contrast of the bow, the national weapon of the Parthian, with the Roman sword would be strikingly suggestive, and the parallels make the allusion clear. The second woe, that which follows the sixth trumpet, is the loosing of the angels bound on the 'great river Euphrates,' who are made ready for that 'hour, and day, and month, and year,' that they might slay a third of mankind by means of the countless number of their cavalry—'twice ten thousand times ten thousand.' Both that passage and the one we are considering belong to the portion of the book

¹ In Apoc. v. 9, 10, the true reading is: 'Thou hast redeemed to God in Thy blood [men] of every race, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made them to our God a kingdom and priests, and they shall reign upon the earth.'

² *ἐν μεσσηνίᾳ*, Apoc. viii. 13, xiv. 6, xix. 17.

³ The third and fourth riders symbolize simply Famine and Death. The view that the four riders represent the conquests of Augustus' reign, the judicial murders under Tiberius, the famine under Claudius, and the final catastrophe, moral and political, of Nero's days, is ingenious enough to deserve mention, but hardly so convincing as to win acceptance.

where historical events are not yet shadowed forth in literal detail; but when we read that the sixth vial—note the sameness of the number¹—is the drying up of Euphrates that the way may be made ready for the kings from the East, it is impossible not to see that St. John looks forward to a great Parthian invasion and to the victory of these hereditary foes of Rome, as one of God's greatest instruments of judgment upon the sinful and anti-Christian empire.² If we could put ourselves into the position of an Oriental in the first century after Christ, we should conceive of the two states very differently from what we probably do now. For us, the long tale of the Roman Empire and its enduring influence over all Western institutions overshadows everything in history. To him the defeat of Crassus on the plain of Carrhae was an earnest of what might come to pass again. We cannot, it is true, suppose that St. Paul would under any conceivable circumstances have shared St. John's triumphant expectation of an Eastern victory, followed by a break up of the Roman Empire and the destruction of the City. To him, as indeed to us, that must have seemed the prevalence of barbarism over civilization, of stagnation over progress. But St. John was no Roman citizen like St. Paul; he only saw the other truth, that Rome slew the righteous, and lived delicately and sinfully, and he looked forward to her reward.

As the first and second seals foreshadow under the general types of war and bloodshed the political situation developed more fully later on, so in the fifth seal the contest between the Church and the Empire, which is the theme of the central chapters of the book, is already glanced at in the cry of the Martyrs from below the Altar. But their company is not yet complete; others of their brethren and fellow servants must be put to death even as they; they must rest yet a little while. Not till the end of the seals and of all but one of the trumpets—not till the seer has received and swallowed the little Book that was sweet to the mouth, because it foretold the destruction of the Church's enemies, but bitter to the belly for the tribulations that should precede the end, at which the elect themselves might almost fail—not till the fresh commission is pronounced that he should prophesy again before peoples and kings—do the predictions take definite shape,

¹ Apoc. ix. 13, xvi. 12.

² Mommsen, *R. P.* ii. p. 1, *n.* The Christian reader may naturally see an ultimate fulfilment of these anticipations in the Mahomedan conquest of the East, as also of the judgments denounced against the city of Rome in the barbarian invasions of the West.

and the lineaments of individual character and historical events emerge from the record.

First of all the seer is now bidden to measure or separate the earthly Temple, with its altar and worshippers, from the outer court occupied by the Gentiles, who are to tread under foot the Holy City forty and two months. By a literal interpretation of this passage the school of critics of whom Renan is a type seek at once to establish the date of the book as concurrent with the siege of Jerusalem, and to overthrow its credit by foisting upon it a definite guarantee of the safety of the inner Temple, which was in every respect falsified. But the forty-two months have, and can have, nothing to do with any idea of the duration of Titus' siege; they are an epoch similar in character to the 1260 days of the prophecy of the Witnesses and to the three days and a half during which their corpses will lie unburied, as well as to the 1260 days, or 'time, times, and half a time,' for which the Woman is sheltered in the wilderness, and to the forty-two months of the power of the Beast.¹ Twelve hundred and sixty days are exactly equal to forty-two months, or three and a half years; and this period is the half of seven, the perfect number of God's rest, and denotes, therefore (like the 'midst of the week' of Daniel ix. 27), the broken imperfect nature of that which opposes itself to the Divine. Moreover the Temple of God with its worshippers is of course to the Christian seer not the material temple of Jerusalem, but the earthly aspect of God's spiritual temple, the Church militant, besieged and assaulted by the powers of the world, trodden under foot, all save the inner shrine where man cannot penetrate, during the allotted time.

Synchronous with this same period is that of the Prophecy of the two Witnesses, in whom ancient exegesis (before Tichonius, who explained them allegorically as the Two Testaments, the Law and the Gospel) was unanimous in seeing a reference to two definite personages; unanimous also in making them both out to be Old Testament saints risen again; unanimous in accepting Elijah as the one, though Enoch, Moses, and Jeremiah are suggested in turn for the other.² Probably this whole tendency of interpretation was governed by the belief that the place of their martyrdom, the 'great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt,

¹ Apoc. xi. 2, 3, 9, 11; xii. 6, 14; xiii. 5. Dionysius of Alexandria (ap. Eus. *H. E.*, vii. 10) applies the last passage to the duration of Valerian's persecution.

² For Enoch we have Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Ephrem Syrus, Jerome, Augustine, and Andreas; for Moses, Hilary of Poitiers; for Jeremiah, Victorinus, quoting 'omnes veteres nostri.'

where also their Lord was crucified,' meant Jerusalem. But Jerusalem was not a great city, and in fact the 'great city' never in the whole book means anything else than Rome;¹ the parallels of Sodom and Egypt, the types of sin and of oppression, apply to Rome, but not to Jerusalem; and these considerations, which are not open to doubt, must rule the meaning of the localization of the Crucifixion. We would not lay any stress on the story of the answer to St. Peter's question, *Domine, quo vadis?*—'I go to be crucified again in Rome.' But whether the Romans or the Jews were ultimately responsible for the death of Christ was a topic on which the balance swayed from side to side in Christian circles according to the circumstances of the hour. The anti-Jewish polemic of the second century represented by the Gospel of Peter emphasized the washing of Pilate's hands as proof of his guiltlessness, and laid responsibility wholly on Herod and the Jews. For the victims of Roman persecution, on the other hand, for St. John at Patmos, our Lord was 'crucified under Pontius Pilate,' the Captain of that noble army of His martyrs, who might all be said in a figurative but very real sense to have suffered, as so many had literally done, in the streets of the great city. But it was on the identification of the city with the Jewish capital that the patristic explanation of the witnesses was based; prophets at Jerusalem would be naturally Old Testament saints, and among them the most obvious were the two who had never known death, Enoch and Elijah, or the two who typified law and prophecy at the Transfiguration, Elijah and Moses. It is in favour of the latter pair that terms taken from their miracles are employed to describe the miracles of the witnesses. Only (though we still differ with diffidence from so impressive a catena of ancient tradition) there seems to us to be no longer reason, when the reference to Jerusalem is removed, to limit the area of choice to the saints of the older dispensation; rather, while we follow the main body of the Fathers in believing the witnesses to be individual prophets, yet since St. John elsewhere, when he enters into detail equally closely, seems to connect the future with what had happened or was happening in his own experience, the same may well be the case here. And who were the two great witnesses of the Christian faith, the two candlesticks which stand before the Lord of the whole earth, the two most illustrious victims of the Beast,² the martyrs whose bodies lay in the 'great city,' and

¹ Apoc. xvi. 19; xvii. 18; xviii. 10, 16, 18, 19, 21.

² 'The Beast which cometh up out of the abyss' (xi. 7) is proved by xvii. 8 to be Nero. If the coming out of the abyss there means, as it

were to be, in another sense than it was given to St. John to foresee, gazed on by men of all peoples and tribes and nations and tongues? It is rash to suggest a view of so well-known a passage which we believe is new; but if a recent commentator is near the mark in comparing with the two Beasts the two Witnesses as 'designed to symbolize, one of them the Church's outward organisation and polity, and the other her spiritual and evangelical teaching,'¹ that would be an additional reason for seeing at least a partial reference to the persons of the two chief Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul.

After the episode of the two Witnesses the seventh trumpet sounds. Just as at the opening of the seventh seal there had been a silence in heaven, as of expectation of a crisis, for the space of a half-hour, followed soon after by lightnings, voices, thunders, and earthquakes, so here, again, similar phenomena accompany the blowing of the seventh trumpet. The heavenly Temple opens, and the ark of God's covenant, the secret of His innermost purpose, is for a moment seen. The mystery of the Incarnation and the strife of celestial powers which it calls forth are now shadowed out for us that we may recognize afterwards the corresponding developments of the struggle upon earth. That the Man-child is the Incarnate Christ whose birth excites the enmity of the Dragon against Him and His mother admits of no doubt. It is less easy to speak confidently about the Woman whose garment is the sun, and her coronal the stars, who flees into the desert to escape the Dragon, whose seed are all the faithful witnesses of Jesus. Neither the Virgin Mary nor the Church answers to all the elements of the picture; for the Church can hardly be termed appropriately the mother of Christ, unless we understand exclusively the Jewish Church (which seems out of place), while His real mother's history in no sense that we know of anticipated the persecutions of the Bride. But then we remember that the same difficulty meets us repeatedly in primitive Christianity. On the earliest sarcophagi a female figure is often depicted in the central place in such a way that sometimes she is naturally identified with the Blessed Virgin, sometimes with the Church. Or, again, in the striking inscription of Abercius of Hieropolis,² a Phrygian seems to do, his restoration to life (see below), we may perhaps think of St. John as conceiving of a similar return to life on the part of his two chief victims.

¹ Archdeacon Lee in the *Speaker's Commentary*, *ad loc.* A general acknowledgment here must suffice for the help which in many cases we have found in this excellent piece of work.

² Rediscovered by the energy and activity of Professor Ramsay, and

bishop of the end of the second century, the 'great clean fish from the fountain,' which is the Christian's food in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, is 'grasped by a pure virgin.' In all these cases, and in St. John's Apocalypse as well, the figures of the Virgin Mother, the type of Christian womanhood, and of the Church personified as a woman, seem to melt into one another and to be really indistinguishable.

The remaining chapters with which we have to deal unfold the drama of the similar struggle which follows between the Woman's seed and the Dragon's representative, the Beast, worked out—at any rate as it immediately presents itself to the mind of the seer—in the death-grapple then proceeding between the Church of St. John's day and the Empire of Rome. All the various forms of wild animal life which in Daniel's vision had characterized the successive lordships of the world are concentrated before St. John's eyes in the representation of the last and greatest of them. Rising out of the sea—and to St. John alike as a Hebrew and in his station at Patmos the sea is always the Mediterranean and therefore the West—the Beast not only subdued to his sway all the nations of the world, but by the help of his minister the False Prophet compelled them to acknowledge his material power as Divine. It is the horror excited by this blasphemous claim of identity with God, almost more than the war waged against the saints, which oppresses the conscience of the Apostle, and without stretching the point too far, this would appear to be a valid argument for the days of Domitian rather than of Nero. No doubt the earlier emperor received this idolatrous homage: but his reign marks no such stage in the development of the *cultus* as Domitian's claim to the title 'Our Lord and God.'¹ At the same time, we have, for our own part, no hesitation in accepting the identification—popularized by Renan, but not invented by him, for it is at least as old as Victorinus—of the head of the Beast stricken to death and healed with the general expectation of Nero's return. If anyone is sceptical as to the immense influence upon popular Christian eschatology of this cycle of ideas about Nero, we venture to refer him to the chronicles and other authorities quoted in a late number of this Review.² St. John, it should be noticed, nowhere asserts that Nero was not killed in

through his means presented to his Holiness Pope Leo XIII. for the Vatican Museum.

¹ Cf. Westcott, *Church and the World* (*Epistles of St. John*, pp. 255, 262): Ramsay, p. 275.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1892, pp. 125-8.

A.D. 68; he does not commit himself to an identification with one or other of the false Neros; but he does look for Nero's resurrection from the abyss as a final manifestation of the anti-Christian spirit of the empire, ushering in its final overthrow. How exactly St. John's system of the 'seven kings' is to be explained we do not pretend to decide. No doubt it is at first sight more easily interpreted if the Apostle is writing in A.D. 69 than twenty or twenty-five years later. Yet Victorinus felt no difficulty in reckoning back from Domitian as the sixth, through Titus, Vespasian, Vitellius, and Otho, to Galba as the first. This calculation has the drawback that it does not really include Nero among the seven, and we prefer to suppose that St. John omits one of the three ephemeral emperors as not fully recognized in the East, and makes Nero both the first and the eighth. In commencing the seven heads of the anti-Christian power with Nero rather than with Julius or Augustus the Apostle is faithful to historical accuracy. Augustus was dead before the Christian Church was founded. His immediate successors can in no sense be said to have finally declared themselves against Christianity, and their position as heads of the Beast who makes war on the saints and overcomes them would be at least ambiguous. It is with Nero that the empire first ranges itself with Antichrist; it will be in the second Nero that the identification will be complete.¹

One more element in the Apocalyptic conception of the powers banded against the Church is introduced in the seventeenth chapter, the rider of the Beast, the Harlot with whom the kings of the earth committed fornication. The seer himself receives the explanation that this is the great city which has dominion over the world, seated on her seven hills like the harlot on the seven-headed beast. As the whore was drunk in the vision with the blood of saints and martyrs of Jesus, so in the mystical Babylon was found the blood of prophets and saints and all them that were slain on the earth. This pre-eminence is not to be understood simply of the Neronian persecution, nor of such martyrs as belonged to the church of the City under the Flavian emperors: it includes also Christians condemned in the eastern provinces, and sent to

¹ Of the Number of the Beast we will only say that the triple six is intended as a triple, that is, a complete, failure to reach the perfect number seven: *corruptio optimi pessima*. For the rest, Irenæus's remark is the most sensible—that if it had been needful that the name should be proclaimed openly in his own day it would already have been proclaimed long ago by the seer himself—and one of the solutions he mentions, *Δαριώης*, perhaps the most probable of any.

Rome, like St. Ignatius, to suffer in the amphitheatre ;¹ indeed, if the hypothesis of St. John's having been in Rome himself be rejected, it must be these martyrs from his own churches who are chiefly in his thoughts. So direct is the responsibility of Rome for the persecution of the Church, that the first foretaste of the execution of God's judgments is the desolation of the 'great city,' when the ten kings who are the horns of the Beast—the various kingdoms out of which the Roman Empire grew—shall turn to hatred of the harlot whose sin they have shared, and shall abandon her to desolation and shame. The city will be burnt with fire, the ruins will be the haunt only of unclean animals and of demons ; in one single day her sins and cruelty find an overflowing recompense. Only at a point later still does the vengeance on the Beast himself find its accomplishment. The armies of heaven under their leader overthrow the combined forces of the kings and of the Beast ; the Beast and his minister, the False Prophet, are cast alive into the lake of fire ; Satan is bound for a period, and the thousand years' reign of the martyrs and saints who had not joined in the worship of the Beast in his time of power is ushered in. Here, then, the career of the Roman Empire as Satan's great instrument on earth is brought to a close ; in the resuscitation of the forces of evil which precedes the final consummation it is not mentioned and takes no part.

In summing up at this point the historical position indicated by this strange yet powerful imagery, the one clear result is, that a condition of things is contemplated where the State is pitted in a hand-to-hand struggle with the Christian Church, in which the life of one combatant could only be purchased at the price of the death of the other. No one sudden outbreak of fury is an adequate explanation ; it is a relation which has become normal, and has lasted so continuously that no modification or relaxation of it is anticipated even as a possibility. St. John is the exponent of the indignant hatred which has been burnt into the conscience of the Christian community by the ruthless cruelty of a generation : the Apocalypse is unintelligible unless the savagery of Nero has become the settled policy of the Flavian house. Domitian, as he was the worst of his family, so he was the fiercest persecutor ; but his general attitude to the Church was not invented but inherited. By the gradual processes which pass unnoticed by historians, the ministers of government passed from accusations of crime to the accusation of Christianity. The confession of the Name, the refusal to participate

¹ Mommsen, *R. P.* ii. 197 n.

in the worship of the Emperor, was enough. The period from Vespasian to Trajan was a true reign of terror for the Church, and the strain and stress have left their visible marks on all the Christian literature of the period; on the Epistles of St. Clement and St. Ignatius; on the Shepherd of Hermas; but most of all on the Apocalypse.

The recognition and inculcation of this truth is perhaps the greatest of the many merits of Professor Ramsay's book. Without it, the sequence of events loses all coherence; admit it, and the rescript of Trajan brings itself into line with the history that leads up to it, not as the formulation of a new policy of proscription, but as the regulation and amelioration of a continuous tradition of repression. Each reader of the *Church and the Roman Empire* is bound to reserve for himself the right to differ in details—for instance, the dating of the First Epistle of St. Peter at about A.D. 75 is a view which would need careful weighing before it could be accepted—but none will fail to recognize that we have in the writer of the book the potentialities of a master of history.

ART. X.—MR. ANDREW LANG AND HOMER.

Homer and the Epic. By ANDREW LANG, M.A., Hon. LL.D., St. Andrews, Honorary Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. (London, 1893).

IT is satisfactory to find Mr. Lang, whose sympathies on the Homeric question have often had incidental expression in sonnet, leaderette, and essay, descending definitely into the arena of scholarly controversy, and giving reason for the faith that is in him in a set treatise. What that faith is, in its broad outlines, can hardly need to be stated. In the controversy between the scholars who dissect and the poets (and lovers of literature generally) who worship an undivided Homer, Mr. Lang is on the side of the angels. Were he what his opponents might describe as 'a mere literary man' his testimony would add little to the authority of a side which has already, to cite one champion only, Mr. Matthew Arnold. In answer to such an one Homeric scholars can fairly urge that he has not given the subject that minute study on which their own conclusions are founded. But against Mr. Lang at least that objection cannot lie. Mr. Lang has studied the German commentators and their

English followers with a minuteness which leaves nothing to be desired, and his pages bristle with their names—Wolf and Wilamowitz, Lachmann and Nutzhorn, 'Benicken and Bäumlein, Holm and Düntzer, Gerlach and Cauer, Köchly, Jacob, Kiene, Giseke, Genz, Bernhardt, Bergk' (p. 157), fortisque Gyas fortisque Cloanthus—as thickly as those of some disciple of the Higher Criticism of the Old or the New Testament. Mr. Lang is indeed in a perilous state; for if he is wrong he certainly sins against light—confusing and bewildering light it may be, but plenty of it. Therefore his book is worth reading, if only from the sporting desire of seeing a free fight. In Mr. Lang's hands one is at least safe against dulness, and one may feel sure of being amused and instructed in many points of miscellaneous learning. His reader is in the same happy state as the casual guest of Præd's vicar,—

'If, when he reached his journey's end
And warmed himself in court or college,
He had not gained an honest friend,
And twenty curious scraps of knowledge;
If he departed as he came,
With no new light on love or liquor,
Good sooth, the traveller was to blame,
And not the vicarage, nor the vicar.'

It would be doing Mr. Lang an injustice, however, to imply that his treatise is of a light and flippant description. His arguments are solid and serious, and if he abounds with illustrations from other works of literature that is by no means to his discredit. The argument from literary analogy is one of the fairest and most legitimate that can be used in this controversy. The question is not merely one of minute research and comparison of one Homeric word or line with another. The discrepancies and inconsistencies, real and imaginary, revealed by this method need to be regarded in the broader light of literary history and literary sense. Few contemporary writers have a wider knowledge of miscellaneous literature than Mr. Lang, and the application of this knowledge to the Homeric controversy is one of the most valuable features of his work, and one which we would willingly have seen extended even further.

The question as to the divided authorship of the Homeric poems has been before the world since the days of the Alexandrian scholars, but its acute stage has not quite attained its century. It was in 1795 that Wolf published his *Prolegomena*, in which he propounded his view of the

piecemeal composition of the *Iliad* and of its redaction into a single poem under the auspices of Pisistratus. It is accordingly with a detailed description and examination of Wolf's treatise that Mr. Lang begins his work (pp. 18-78), though the immediate provocation which has moved him to uplift his testimony would appear to be rather the *Companion to the Iliad*, recently published by his whilom collaborator in translation, Mr. Walter Leaf. The criticism of Wolf is followed by a full analysis of the *Iliad*, book by book, in the course of which the main arguments of the sceptics are stated and discussed (pp. 79-221). The same method is then applied to the *Odyssey* (pp. 222-322); and the rest of the book (pp. 323-422) is occupied by some useful chapters on the lost epics of Greece, on Homer and archæology, and on other early epics which may be put into comparison with Homer, notably the *Song of Roland* and the *Kalewala*; to which we should have liked to see added equally full examinations of the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Morte d'Arthur*. We have, then, here a serious attempt to meet, on grounds of literary criticism and common sense, the arguments of those who see in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* patchwork compositions of many men and many periods.

Wolf's theory contained three principal propositions, of which two embody his view of the nature of the Homeric poems, while the third is the main supposition upon which that view is based. His view is, first, that the poems were originally detached lays, handed down by oral recitation of minstrels at courts and festivals; and, secondly, that Pisistratus was the first to have them committed to writing and brought into that order in which we now possess them. The supposition which lies at the root of this theory is that writing was unknown to the Greeks at the time of the composition of the poems. For each of these propositions there is some evidence to be adduced; and yet it is not too much to say that not one of the three is admitted to be sound by the representatives of advanced criticism to-day. Wolf's theory is, in fact, abandoned by his successors, although the spirit which animated his inquiry animates them also. A few sentences will indicate the position of the controversy on these points at the present time.

With regard to the knowledge of writing, all that can be said is that there is no certain evidence available, but that such additional testimony as has come to light since Wolf's day is not favourable to his view. In the first place, we now have specimens of Greek writing which go back, not indeed

to the
any
cert
Chr
of t
form
hind
be t
Ag
rem
or c
Gre
piec
othe
mar
to H
inst
test
abs
time
logy
moc
prob
uns
mitt
inde
long
Lan
med
and
ing
care
rhap

bein
it ap
upon
theo
the
Lach
pen
part
Hon
tain

to the Homeric age, nor near it, but considerably earlier than any known to Wolf. The earliest writings on papyrus are certainly as old as the beginning of the third century before Christ, very possibly of the end of the fourth; and the value of their testimony lies in the fact that the free and cursive forms of the letters show that they have a long history behind them, and that the stiff forms of inscriptions are not to be taken as representing the common handwriting of the day. Again, when we find Greek mercenaries in Egypt scratching remarks on the leg of a statue at Abu Simbel in the seventh or early sixth century, it is quite clear that the origin of Greek writing must lie considerably further back. To these pieces of direct evidence may be added presumptions on other grounds. Writing on papyrus was known in Egypt many centuries earlier than the highest date we need assign to Homer; the great Ani papyrus in the British Museum, for instance, is dated about B.C. 1370. And whereas Egyptian testimony was formerly barred on account of the supposed absence of intercourse between Greece and Egypt before the time of Psammetichus, we now have the evidence of archaeology to show that there was a very active exchange of commodities between the two peoples at a very early date indeed, probably for some centuries before B.C. 1000. It is, therefore, unsafe to argue that long poems could not have been committed to writing in the age assigned to Homer. Wolf, indeed, urges further that it would not have paid to copy out long poems, since there was no reading public; but Mr. Lang fairly disposes of this argument by referring to the mediæval *trouvères*, who had copies of the *Song of Roland* and other *chansons de geste* simply for the purpose of refreshing their own memories, not to be published, but rather to be carefully preserved from coming into the possession of rival rhapsodists.¹

The argument against an early knowledge of writing being thus shown to be of even more doubtful weight than it appeared in Wolf's time, the superstructure which he built upon it loses much of any stability it may have had. The theory that the Homeric poems were originally composed in the shape of comparatively short lays was developed by Lachmann, who analysed the *Iliad* into eighteen independent *Lieder*; but this view, though it still has some partial adherents, has now been abandoned by nearly all Homeric scholars. One argument against it is the uncertainty of the division. Lachmann carved out eighteen lays;

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, pp. 64, 65.

Köchly made sixteen completely different ones, omitting books x. and xix. to xxiii.; Christ made forty; while a still later writer, Dr. Erhardt, thinks that no one can fail to see that there were eighteen, but his division is not that of any of his predecessors. Moreover it is hard to see how the juxtaposition of eighteen, or any other number, of independent lays could give the general unity of conception which is admitted to run through at least a large part of the *Iliad*. The theory which has taken its place is that of a central core, commonly described as 'the Achilleid,' or 'the Wrath of Achilles,' round which large accretions of alien and often inconsistent matter have gradually been collected. Of this more will have to be said presently; but first it is necessary to deal with Wolf's third proposition, the editorship of Pisistratus.

That a final authoritative editor is essential to any disintegrating theory was fully recognized by Wolf, though, as Mr. Lang more than once points out, it is unduly neglected by many modern critics. The diverse materials of the epic could not have flowed together by the impulsion of a mere centripetal force; they must have been put together by an editor, whose work was accepted by subsequent ages as authoritative. Such an editor Wolf found in Pisistratus, and he adduces ancient evidence which he regards as convincing.¹ Cicero states that 'Pisistratus is said to have been the first to arrange in their present order the books of Homer, previously in disarray;' Pausanias, that 'Pisistratus collected the Homeric poems, which were dispersed and known in memory in various quarters.' Josephus is more explicit: 'They say that even Homer did not leave his poetry in writing, but that it was transmitted by memory, and afterwards put together from the separate songs; hence the number of discrepancies which it presents.' He does not, however, mention Pisistratus as the editor. Some still later compilers give substantially the same story. Modern criticism has, however, almost universally discredited it. It is observable that the earliest authority, Cicero, is 500 years later than Pisistratus, and that even he says nothing which implies more than a collection and setting in order of the several books of the poem, which would naturally be written on distinct rolls, and might consequently lose their proper order of sequence. Further, a much earlier authority, Ephorus, attributes the bringing of the Homeric poems to Greece from Asia to Lycurgus (*circ.* 776 B.C.) Mr. Monro considers these contradictory

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, p. 37.

leger
late
sion
early
Pisistratus
both
lead
to i
adv
V
unsc
from
ing
This
wha
cess
form
Her
into
mos
this
we
was
Ag
by
on t
and
ing
Ach
His
xv.
stria
grou
con
two
are
vii.
men
Gre
ther
boo
such

legends, together with that which declares that Solon regulated the recital of the poems by the rhapsodists, to be versions of a single story, told in turn of the chief statesmen of early Greek history.¹ Ludwich, a careful critic, describes the Pisistratus hypothesis as a fable.² Professor Jebb calls it both doubtful and vague.³ Indeed, it is safe to say that no leading scholar, whether English or Continental, still adheres to it, at least in anything like the form in which it was advanced by Wolf.

Wolf's theory, then, is now generally considered to be unsound in all its principal parts; but a theory developed from Wolf's has had better success, and, in more or less varying shapes, still holds the field among Homeric scholars. This theory is, in brief, to the effect that one poet composed what we may call a skeleton *Iliad*, and that various successors filled up the framework till the poem assumed the form in which we now have it. This was the contention of Hermann, amplified by Nitzsch, developed and introduced into England by Grote, and now held by Jebb, Leaf, and most of the leading scholars of the Continent. According to this theory the original poet (whom we may call Homer if we choose) composed a short epic of which the central motive was the wrath of Achilles, relating the provocation given by Agamemnon, the withdrawal of Achilles, the promise given by Zeus to Thetis to avenge the insult by bringing disaster on the Greeks, the fulfilment of this promise, the intervention and death of Patroclus, the return of Achilles, and the slaying of Hector. Grote's scheme assigned to this original *Achilleid* books i., viii., and xi. to xxii. of our present *Iliad*. His successors have rejected book viii. and also books xii. to xv. inclusive, and the original poem is consequently restricted now to books i., xi., xvi.-xxii., and even in this last group there are held to be several interpolated passages of considerable length.

The grounds upon which the rejected books (constituting two-thirds of the entire *Iliad*) have been thrown overboard are various, but they may be briefly summarized. Books ii.-vii. go because in them the promise of Zeus receives no fulfilment, the fighting being, on the whole, favourable to the Greeks. Book ix. is condemned, partly because the embassy therein described is held to be inconsistent with a passage in book xvi., in which Achilles appears to ignore the fact that such an embassy has been sent, and partly because the highly

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, p. 70.

² *Ibid.* p. 77.

³ *Introduction to Homer*, p. 114.

rhetorical tone of the speeches contained in it is thought to be alien to the tone of the earlier poem. The condemnation of book ix. carries with it that of book viii., a somewhat baldly described defeat of the Greeks, which paves the way for the embassy. Book x. contains an episode which has no connexion with the general course of the narrative, and its tone and vocabulary are very different from those of the rest of the poem; hence it is very generally abandoned, even by those who are most staunch in upholding Homeric unity. Books xii. to xv. are banished because the narrative of the fighting about the wall of the Greek camp is very confused, and because the action of Patroclus, described at the end of book xi., appears to be continued naturally in book xvi., and not to admit of so long an interval as that which is necessitated by these books. Finally, books xxiii. and xxiv. are rejected mainly on the ground of their language and style, which are considered to be more akin to the *Odyssey* than to the *Iliad*.

These are, in broad outline, the main objections which strike at the entire fabric of the poem; but an immense amount of energy and ingenuity is spent in elaborating objections to shorter passages and single lines. It is here that the absurdities abound which make Homeric criticism a byword with the 'plain man.' With these Mr. Lang's readers are at intervals regaled, and they serve to lighten the course of serious argument. When Fick, for instance, rejects the whole of the fight over the body of Patroclus because the first lines of the *Iliad* say that Achilles's wrath 'gave the bodies of heroes to the dogs and birds,' and that consequently there could be no fight over the body of a hero, one can only gasp in astonishment at such an extraordinary want of taste, common sense, and even humour. On this Mr. Leaf solemnly remarks that 'the objection is not foundation enough for so sweeping a conclusion.'¹ Mr. Leaf expunges the garrulous discourse of Nestor, in book xi., as 'one of the clearest cases of interpolation in the *Iliad*,' because 'it is singularly out of place at the moment when Patroclus has refused even to sit down, owing to the urgency of his mission.' We can only answer, with Mr. Lang, that 'if Mr. Leaf has never met an intelligent old bore, whom no one could check by refusing to sit down, we envy his inexperience of misfortune.'² One might as well object to the discourses of Mrs. Poyser or Mrs. Tulliver that they are not strictly logical. Agamemnon is not allowed to cut the boar's throat in book xix. 266

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, p. 102.

² *Ibid.* p. 154.

because he has a wounded arm (xi. 252) ; and, earlier in the poem, Fick ingenuously sends him into battle dressed in a soft tunic and great cloak!¹ But, in truth, when a critic is on the scent for interpolations any evidence is good enough for him. If a suspicious passage is not alluded to in any other part of the poem it is therefore spurious ; if it is alluded to, clearly the lines containing those allusions are spurious and have been inserted in order to lead up to the passage in question.² Hesiod gives a different genealogy of Alcinous and Arete from that in the *Odyssey* ; therefore, according to Kirchhoff, this part of the *Odyssey* is later than Hesiod : on which Mr. Lang naturally remarks that one might equally argue that the writer of the *Odyssey* evidently did not know Hesiod, and therefore Hesiod is later than the *Odyssey*.³ Some lines are cancelled because they contain repetitions, others because they are unduly new. Lines are fetched from different parts of the poem into collocations which the critic thinks more suitable for them, until an edition of the *Iliad* such as Köchly's has the appearance of being the result of pitching all the lines of Homer individually into a bag and drawing them out at random.

These, however, are merely the aberrations of criticism, and will never carry much weight, if only for the reason that too much depends on the personal equation of the critic, and no two theorizers can agree on the same results. It is this exaggeration of fault-finding that gives German criticism the reputation of pedantry, especially among those who have least experience of it at first hand. The real merits of that criticism are obscured by it ; but it would not be fair on that account to refuse to recognize them. The admirable industry, thoroughness, and independence of German scholars have done incalculable service to the study of the classics. Even when the results are doubtful the process is stimulative. No doubt German criticism has the defects of its qualities. Industry sometimes makes mountains out of molehills ; thoroughness becomes pedantry, overwhelming the spirit by the letter ; and independence becomes dogmatism, the more self-assertive when real evidence is weak. If English scholars can assimilate, as some have done, the thoroughness without the dogmatism, they will have learnt the best lesson which Germany has to teach us. Dogmatism on insufficient grounds provokes contradiction, and alienates more assent than it wins. It is for this reason that so much of the

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, pp. 93, 201.

² *Ibid.* pp. 120, 141, 156, 179, 186.

³ *Ibid.* p. 286.

Homeric criticism which we receive from Germany disgusts, instead of convincing, the English reader. The result is unfortunate, for the young student, seeing the absurdities and trivialities which are quoted from German criticism by its opponents (and by no one more effectively than by Mr Lang), concludes that such critics cannot be worth attending to, and thereby fails to make acquaintance with German scholarship, and loses the lessons which, in the hands of its best exponents, it is able to teach him. Thus, in respect of Homer, the wearisome iteration with which suspicion is thrown upon passages for insufficient reasons predisposes the reader to suspect the validity of the more important arguments. On the other hand, the critic of the minute school, seeing that his opponents disregard all his small points and confine themselves to broader and more general arguments, suspects them of want of thoroughness and detailed acquaintance with the questions at issue, and consequently attaches no weight to their opinions even on the wider issues with which they deal.

But in fact it is these wider issues that must be decided first. If it can be shown that the *Iliad* is a composite mass with at least four or five strongly-marked lines of cleavage, we shall then recognize that the hands of editors and redactors have been at work upon it, and shall be prepared to find traces of their operations in small matters as well as in great. But if the evidence for the breaking up of the mass of the poem is unconvincing, we shall hardly be persuaded by a collection of supposed peculiarities in vocabulary or inconsistencies in the minor details of the narrative. To these we, for our part, attach the very smallest weight. Arguments from supposed differences in vocabulary and from the use of strange words have a plausibility which is only apparent. An application of them where their results can be tested shows that a case could in this way be made out for rejecting as spurious the most undoubted works of modern poets. A common argument against certain portions of the *Iliad* is that words are used in it which do not occur in the admittedly genuine books. A reference to a Concordance of Pope's works shows that in the space of the single letter C the following words occur only in the *Dunciad*: *caitiff, cant, captious, circulate, class, closet, cloudy, cock, commonweal, conduce, confirm, console, cord, curve*. By going through the whole alphabet one might make a formidable list of words which occur only in this poem (none of them specially appropriate to it rather than to others), and collectively justify-

ing a serious suspicion that it must be the work of another author. The attribution of *Paradise Regained* to the author of *Paradise Lost* may be shown to be similarly precarious. To the former poem are peculiar the following words: *chant, childhood, civility, cleave, coals, comforted, compliments, confident, contemplate, contemplative, contradict, craft, cumbersome, cumbrance*. Nor is the occurrence of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα any more valid as a ground of suspicion. In four pages, chosen absolutely at haphazard, of the Concordance to Pope no less than forty ἀπαξ λεγόμενα are found; and a recent controversy has incidentally shown similar results in the case of Aristotle. A writer's vocabulary is not constant. Words and phrases enter his mind which he may perhaps use several times within a comparatively short space, and then never again. Arguments based on enumerations of this kind are almost worthless, unless they are used simply to reinforce an otherwise justifiable proposition.

The arguments against the unity of the *Iliad* are not, however, all of this kind. The acutest critics of a century, together with others at various intervals during twenty centuries, would not have been led to dismember this progenitor of all epics without some real grounds of grave suspicion. We have already briefly indicated the general nature of these; but we propose now to describe them at somewhat greater length, and to try to form some estimate of their value. The first great passage which is held to be irreconcilable with the scheme of the original poem is that which is contained in books ii. to vii. inclusive. The contents of these are, briefly, the lying dream of Agamemnon, with the marshalling of the hosts which follows it, the duel between Paris and Menelaus, the treacherous breach of the truce by the Trojan Pandarus, a general engagement in which Diomedes distinguishes himself, Hector's parting with Andromache and duel with Ajax, and the burying of the dead with which the battle ends. To these books the objection is that they are inconsistent with the promise made by Zeus to Thetis that he will cause the discomfiture of the Greeks in order to avenge the insult to Achilles. It is represented that this will be brought about through the agency of the lying dream which is sent to Agamemnon; but, in fact, the result of the fighting which ensues is that Menelaus beats Paris, Ajax has rather the best of it against Hector, and Diomedes inflicts great slaughter on the Trojans. There was nothing in all this to make Agamemnon regret the withdrawal of Achilles. Further, the two duels are regarded as doublets of the same motive,

an inartistic repetition of the same device ; the enumeration of the Greek chieftains by Helen for the information of Priam is out of place in the tenth year of the war, and the Catalogue (apart from other objections special to itself) is equally inappropriate at this stage. These books are held to belong to a poem descriptive of the whole war, and to be wrongly 'contaminated' with the true epic of the Wrath of Achilles.

These objections are perfectly sound in themselves ; but whether we consider them as decisive or not must depend on the view we take of the permissible licence or the inconsistency reasonably to be expected in a long epic of primitive times. The question has fairly to be faced, Does the poem really gain by the excision of these passages ? Is the *Achilleid*, as left us when these and the other passages above enumerated have been expunged, a finer poem than the *Iliad* as we have known it ? And, if we cannot answer this question in the affirmative, are the inconsistencies so great as to forbid us to suppose that the original poet accepted them, consciously or unconsciously, in order that he might heighten the interest of his poem as a whole ? With regard to the gain or loss by the omission of the suspected passages it will be easier to judge when the chief of these passages have been described ; but the inconsistencies of this particular group seem to admit of a fair defence. If Zeus is tied down to fulfil his promise at once and to the letter, the action of the poem becomes brief and comparatively tame. Zeus makes his promise to Thetis, and sends a lying dream to Agamemnon. Next morning the Greeks join battle and are defeated. They are driven to the ships, when Patroclus obtains leave to go to their assistance. He effects a brief rally, but is ultimately killed ; and that evening sees the reconciliation of Achilles with Agamemnon. The reverses of the Greeks last exactly one day, and the person who suffers most by them is Achilles himself, who loses his dearest friend. It is surely not inconceivable that the original poet preferred to fill out this meagre skeleton, even at the risk of superficial inconsistency. Though the scene is laid in the tenth year of the war, yet the readers of the poem know nothing of these years, and it is a very excusable liberty to introduce us to the principal characters by means of the scene (in itself beautiful) of Helen's appearance on the wall of Troy. It is akin to the soliloquies or dialogues at the beginnings of dramas in which the characters narrate, for the benefit of the audience, occurrences which must have been perfectly well known to them already. It is in a similar spirit

that the account of the superiority of the Greeks in the first engagement is given. It shows us something of the relative positions of the Greeks and Trojans during the earlier portion of the siege, and it heightens the interest of the poem by making victory pass visibly from one side to the other. There is, further, an artistic fitness in placing the breach of the truce by the Trojans near the beginning of the poem. The poet's sympathies are with the Greeks, and the poem is to end with a Greek victory. The treachery of the Trojans justifies this sympathy, and reminds the reader that they are the guilty party, and must suffer for their sin. The crime of Pandarus repeats, in a way, the crime of Paris, which falls outside the scope of the poem. Thus the reader or hearer before whom the narrative of these early books has been placed is led into substantially the same state of feeling and knowledge as if he had heard in historical sequence of the offence of Paris, the beginning of the siege, and the early successes of the Greeks. Dramatically, then, the duel between Paris and Menelaus, with its consequences, is thoroughly in place here. The second duel, which is criticized as a mere double of this, is essentially different. It is inserted to gratify the taste of the audience for fighting. It is no longer the injured husband and the traitorous guest—second-rate fighters both of them. It is the leading fighting men on each side, meeting one another with a chivalrous love of battle. Moreover it has a dramatic fitness, arising out of the earlier duel. Hector feels that the Greeks have been defrauded by the escape of Paris and the breaking of the truce, and he does what lies in his power to redress this wrong by offering himself in Paris's place to meet the best of the Greeks, if they wish for satisfaction. Finally, so far as this group of books is concerned, we shall not readily abandon to another than the original Homer the passage in which is described the parting of Hector and Andromache.

We pass to a second great *crux*—the embassy to Achilles described in the ninth book. The objection to this admittedly splendid passage lies in its supposed incompatibility with book xvi. ll. 52-87, in which Achilles, beholding the discomfort of the Greeks, exclaims triumphantly, 'Now methinks that the sons of the Achæans will stand in prayer about my knees, for intolerable need comes upon them.' This is held to show that the composer of book xvi. knew nothing of the prayers which the sons of the Achæans had already made to Achilles, as narrated in book ix. Achilles further cautions Patroclus not to defeat the Trojans too

severely, in order that the Danaans 'may give me back again that fairest maiden, and thereto add glorious gifts;' which, according to book ix., they had already offered to do. Mr. Leaf thinks that to suppose the same poet wrote both these passages 'is to demand a credulity rendering any rational criticism impossible.' Violent assertions of this kind are apt to supply the deficiencies of weak reasoning; hence it is not surprising to find that Mr. Lang not only holds this 'irrational' belief, but maintains that the credulity is all on the side of Mr. Leaf.¹ It may be observed, in the first place, that, on the principles of the destructive critics, nothing could be simpler than to expunge the lines in book xvi.—a course frequently resorted to by those critics when one passage appears to be inconsistent with another or with their own views; as, for instance, Mr. Leaf himself expunges xviii. 448 and xix. 141, because they contain references to the embassy. But Mr. Lang takes sounder ground, and argues that there is no real inconsistency at all. Achilles's taunt about the prayers of the sons of the Achæans, so far from being incompatible with the embassy in book ix., is a triumphant reference to it. 'Now I rather think they'll be coming with their embassies.' He has rejected them once; he will delight in trampling upon them again. It is at any rate clear that the poet of book ix. saw no inconsistency, or why did he not remove it? A reviser who could insert 1,278 lines into the original poem could surely expunge six-and-thirty. 'If it were, in any unexplained way, at any date, possible for a new poet to introduce books viii. and ix., that poet must have had every freedom of action. A stroke of his stylus, or needle, or pen, if he wrote, would have scratched out the 'inconsistencies' of Achilles's speech in book xvi. If he did not write, he would omit them in recitation, and it seems to be the hypotheses that his version was somehow preserved in oral tradition.'² If it be possible to believe that no inconsistency exists at all, it is at least a simpler faith than to hold that a second poet introduced two new books, yet failed to remove the glaring inconsistency which would prove his work to be a later accretion.

But book ix. is not only reconcilable with the rest of the poem, it is even necessary to its plan. Without it Achilles, grossly wronged, withdraws to his tent in anger, but relents, unasked, when half a day's fighting has ended in the discomfiture of the Greeks. The result of his relenting is that his dearest friend is killed, and he himself, by slaying Hector

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, p. 135.

² *Ibid.* p. 136.

in revenge, ensures his own death as a consequence decreed by fate. This is, indeed, much punishment for no fault at all. On the other hand, if the embassy be genuine, Achilles has put himself in the wrong by rejecting the full restitution offered to him by those who had wronged him. For this sin he pays dearly indeed, but not unjustly. It is the common Greek theme; *ἔβρις* ensures punishment, and learning comes only by suffering. Only if this book be genuine is Achilles the 'inexorable' hero known to all subsequent literature.

In no part of his treatise is Mr. Lang more vigorous or more successful than in his defence of book ix. ; and to his pages we must refer the reader. With book ix. stands or falls book viii. also. It is a briefly and somewhat baldly described defeat of the Greeks, leading up to the embassy which follows it, and evidently written for that purpose alone. This baldness is naturally used as an argument against its genuineness, on the ground that it is unworthy of the poet. But this plea will hardly bear examination, since in any case the book is the composition of a poet of the highest rank. The author of the ninth book need fear comparison with none of the many collaborators to whom we are told to attribute our *Iliad*. If the eighth book is of an inferior order of inspiration, as would be generally admitted, we can only say that here the poet nods, whether he be Homer or only another person of the same name. After all it is no more unworthy of Homer than the more pedestrian parts of *Paradise Lost* are of Milton.

The question as to the tenth book stands on a different footing altogether. The narrative contained in it—the night expedition of Odysseus and Diomedes and the capture of Dolon—could be withdrawn without in any degree affecting the story of the *Iliad*. It is never alluded to in any other part of the poem ; it has no bearing on the wrath of Achilles, nor even on the general fortunes of the war. Professor Jebb's conclusion would not usually be disputed when he says that it 'is unquestionably later than any other large part of the *Iliad*. The language gives many indications of this ; and the characteristic nobleness of the *Iliad* here sinks to a lower style and tone.'¹ Mr. Lang does, indeed, defend it, but not with much spirit or success. His main argument rests on the supposed difficulty in accounting for the adoption of any alien matter into the original poem. This is an argument which has much weight as applied to the separatist theory

¹ *Introduction to Homer*, p. 123.

in general. The incorporation of a book like the ninth, affecting the whole course of the story, and involving the insertion or alteration of passages elsewhere in the poem, implies a supreme editorial power over the work of the great primitive poet which is hard indeed to explain. But the insertion of book x. involves no such difficulty. If Pisistratus, or any one else, ever performed the task of gathering together the scattered parts of the *Iliad* (and this, which is quite different from Wolf's theory that the poem was then first written and put into shape, is quite possible, since the whole poem would not have been contained in a single roll), the question would arise whether a canto such as this book belonged to the poem or not. It is very likely that it passed under the name of Homer, just as we know that the Hymn to Apollo did in the time of Thucydides; and in that case it is not surprising if it was incorporated into the collected edition of the *Iliad*. Just so we might imagine an Arthurian idyll being incorporated, generations hence, into the *Idylls of the King* by an editor who had no literary history to guide him. Therefore, in making jettison of this book, we are strengthening, not weakening, as Mr. Lang seems to fear, the case for the unity of the *Iliad*.

Book xi. stands unquestionably part of the original poem, of which the defeat of the Greeks, described in it, is the turning-point, bringing first Patroclus and then Achilles into the field again. But over books xii. to xv. a battle rages as fierce and as confused as that which they themselves describe. At the end of the eleventh book Patroclus has gone to the tent of Machaon to inquire after the wounded physician. There he is left, while we are told in four books of the great fight at the wall, of the storming of the wall by Hector, of the diversion of Zeus's attention by Hera and the consequent rally of the Greeks, of the awakening of Zeus and the imminent peril of the Greek ships, barely averted by Ajax. The fight is exciting enough and appropriate enough, but the description of it is unquestionably confused, and the hiatus in the narration of Patroclus's action is awkward. But this is the worst that can be said. Professor Jebb admits that the books are thoroughly worthy of a great poet, and that our interest never flags in spite of the length of the struggle; all that he urges against them is that 'it is difficult to resist the belief that book xi. was originally designed to be followed more closely by book xvi.'¹ This is hardly a sufficient ground for the rejection of so splendid a battle piece as that

¹ *Introduction*, p. 160.

which these books contain. The poet's own audience would not have complained of having too much fighting, nor will any modern reader who is in sympathy with the poet's spirit. The description of the fighting is confused, but so is an actual battle. Herodotus probably had a clear idea in his own mind of the battle of Marathon, but he has succeeded in mystifying modern critics to a very considerable extent; and the same may be said of Thucydides's siege of Syracuse. Something also may be granted to poetical licence. Mr. Leaf admits that the existence of the river Scamander in the plain before Troy is recognized or ignored by the poet just as it suits him at the moment; and Mr. Lang has a right to ask why he should be more particular about the wall than about the much more permanent river.¹ Moreover, the confusion, if confusion there be, becomes no whit more intelligible by being assigned to the poet of books xii. to xv. than if it is attributed to the poet of the 'primary *Iliad*.' Unless there is strong reason for believing the *Iliad* in general to be a thing of shreds and patches, slight discrepancies, such as those which occur in these books, which might be paralleled from almost any long work of imaginary narrative, are no legitimate ground for questioning their genuineness.²

The seven books which follow are admitted to be, on the whole, genuine parts of the original poem, relating the consummation of the wrath of Achilles through the death of Patroclus and the revenge taken by the bereaved hero on Hector. No doubt this admission does not stay the sceptical activity of the critic, but only diverts it to the shorter passages and single lines, a happy hunting-ground to which we cannot follow him. The two larger passages upon which suspicion has been most directed are the Shield of Achilles and the Theomachy. On these points a few words must suffice. The description of the Shield of Achilles is an episode, and as such it appears detachable, and consequently, on the separatist hypothesis, to be detached. As a matter of fact it resists the process of detachment more than would appear at first sight. Mr. Leaf thinks that the whole conception of the loss of Achilles's armour is due to the interpolator who had composed, and wished to introduce, the description of the new arms fashioned by Hephæstus. Consequently the texture of

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, p. 170.

² Mr. Lang quotes (pp. 111, 112) some curious instances of blunders by Scott and Thackeray, as when the latter makes Master Clavering grow in six years from 4 to 13. If we remember right Miss Yonge has been guilty of a similar oversight.

book xvi. has to be rent to pieces. Lines otherwise unsuspicious are excised by twos and threes, and among them goes so famous a passage as Achilles's shout over the trench. Formerly it was possible to maintain that the state of art described in the Shield was out of keeping with the age of Homer, but that argument no longer holds good, and with it goes the most substantial ground for doubting the genuineness of the episode. The discoveries at Mycenæ and elsewhere, though their exact relation to the art of Homer is open to controversy, unquestionably prove the existence of very considerable artistic skill at an early date, which the large majority of archæologists place before the epoch of the Dorian invasion. In many respects the Mycenæan art is closely parallel with that described in Homer; and in any case it is impossible now to argue that the author of the 'primary *Iliad*' could not have imagined the devices of the Shield of Achilles.

With regard to the Battle of the Gods, it will generally be allowed that it is an unfortunate episode, but it does not follow that it is a later addition. Considering the amount of activity displayed by the gods throughout the *Iliad*, the idea of their actually ranging themselves for battle on behalf of their respective sides is not unnatural. It is the execution that is mainly at fault; and the point at issue is whether a failure of inspiration, or even an unhappy conception, is sufficient proof of different authorship. A reference to literary history is answer enough. No better parallel can be given than the second day's fighting in *Paradise Lost*, when the devils betake themselves to the invention of artillery and Satan exchanges intolerable jests with Beelzebub upon the results. That passage is not less unworthy of Milton than the Theomachy is of Homer. Mr. Lang also makes good use, here and elsewhere, of the argument that the description of gods intervening in human affairs invariably produces confusion; and the irrationality of it is infinitely more apparent to us than it was to the poet's original hearers, of whom alone he had to think. Mr. Lang might have added a parallel, again from *Paradise Lost*. Heresy is, from the literary point of view, the least of the drawbacks to many of the scenes, and especially the colloquies, in Milton's heaven. To apply strict logic to the operations of the gods in Homer is merely to beat the air.

One more great excision remains to be made before the critic has reduced the *Iliad* to its primitive simplicity—that we say not baldness. Hector having been killed in

book xxii., we have no occasion for any more story, and books xxiii. and xxiv. can be dispensed with. But the narrative of the burial of Patroclus and the funeral games, of the visit of Priam to Achilles and the funeral of Hector, are, as Professor Jebb allows, not by any means unsuitable as a conclusion to the poem. To the Greek mind they would not even seem an anti-climax. If Sophocles, the careful and artistic, could add 555 lines to his *Ajax* to show how his dead hero had decent burial, we need find nothing strange in Homer ending his *Iliad* with the funeral rites of Patroclus and Hector, especially when the result is that the poem ends with a splendid and most pathetic book, with a note of conciliation and peace which is a fitting conclusion to the long narrative of battle and bloodshed. It is upon grounds of style and language that these books must be condemned, if at all, and this is an argument which, as we have already urged, must be used with great caution. Several critics have suggested that the tone of these books resembles the *Odyssey* rather than the *Iliad*. Professor Jebb thinks that they also resemble book ix., and may be due to the same author. Dr. Christ, however, places them much earlier than book ix., and thinks that book xxiv. at least may be due to the original poet. Shelley declared that it is only at the end of the poem that Homer begins to be himself. These differences of opinion, which are far from standing alone, may at least suggest the doubtfulness of critical conclusions which rest largely upon subjective impressions of literary style and tone. Stronger arguments are required if we are to deprive the original Homer of the credit of the sublime canto with which the epic ends.

We have now passed in brief review the principal points at which the integrity of the *Iliad* has been assailed. We do not claim to have refuted in a few pages of a magazine all the arguments of all the critics who have devoted their lives and labours to the Homeric question during the last hundred years. Our object has been to suggest the lines upon which those arguments may be met, and to show that the divisibility of the Homeric poems must not be taken for granted. There is no occasion to disguise the difficulties which tell against the unionist belief; but one may fairly hold that a plausible explanation can be given of them, and that the difficulties are not all on one side. The question must finally resolve itself into a comparison of probabilities; and it will be found that there are certain very grave objections to the theory of the separatists. For what does their con-

tention come to—so far, that is, as their divergent theories can be harmonized into some degree of uniformity? They hold that there was once a great poet who composed a short epic on that part of the siege of Troy which is especially centred round the story of the wrath of Achilles. This poem attained great fame and popularity, and was widely known and admired. Therefore poets—not one, nor two, but several—composed additional episodes more or less connected with this central subject; and these they engrafted on the original poem, cunningly, or sometimes blunderingly, riveting them to their place by small insertions or alterations in the body of the poem itself. These additions were apparently adopted by the literary world at large without question; we hear of no controversy over any large section of the poem, of no versions from which one or other of the great interpolations was absent. At a date earlier than our records reach there was an *Iliad* which, though we cannot dogmatize about its line for line correspondence with our modern text, was certainly in all essentials identical with the poem which we now possess.

The difficulties involved in this theory do not need much pointing out. It simply bristles with them. How is it that these interpolators, many of them poets of the highest order, were content to sink their fame in the work of another, and strove only to disguise the fact that their splendid works were not the compositions of the original Homer? How is it that, having sunk their individuality and made their additions, they succeeded in getting them accepted by the rival minstrels of other towns? One would have expected that if a Chian rhapsodist interpolated the Battle at the Wall, Miletus and Smyrna would have taken pleasure in denouncing it as a spurious addition. No doubt, if the poems were being recited in unconnected lays, it would have been open to some editor to work them up into a concordant whole, and this might subsequently have passed as the great original from which the lays had been carved. This was what Wolf held, attributing the editorial work to the literary court of Pisistratus; but the Pisistratus story is generally discredited now, and no other time or place for the great redaction is suggested instead. Without it, however, the separatist theory stands on a very infirm basis. It may be asked, further, why inconsistencies and palpable blunders are necessary signs of interpolation. In modern times if a writer entrusts his work for revision to a friend, it is commonly supposed that the friend is more likely to detect errors in it than the author

himself. A modern reviser removes inconsistencies; he does not go about to sow them broadcast. Why should the reverse state of things be supposed to have prevailed in primitive Greece? The author would not be less likely to make mistakes than he is to-day, and his chances of correcting them himself would be considerably less in the absence of proof sheets and correctors for the press; but there is no reason why the interpolator, deliberately working on an existing poem, should have been guilty of the ineptitudes attributed to him. It is not as if these interpolators were tasteless and ignorant men. On the contrary, we know that they were poets equal to the original Homer himself. Indeed, here is another of the difficulties attached to the separatist theory, that it requires such a prodigality of self-effacing genius of the highest rank. Over what space of time are we to extend the process of expansion, to find room for so many supreme poets? and how, if we extend it far, are we to account for the general uniformity of customs and beliefs? One wrote the parting of Hector and Andromache, and the appearance of Helen at the Scaean gate; another composed the splendid rhetoric of the speeches in the Embassy, another the desperate fighting at the Greek wall and the valorous defence of Ajax, another the Shield wrought by Hephestus; and yet another pictured Priam at the feet of Achilles, and put into words the lamentations of Helen and Andromache over the corpse of Hector. All these are creations of the highest order of genius; all have, as Mr. Matthew Arnold phrased it, the 'great master's genuine stamp'—namely, 'the grand style.'¹ One other period of literature alone shows a group of great poets all thinking much the same thoughts and speaking in much the same language; but even in the age of Elizabeth we could not find five poets whose work was equal to the best of Shakespeare's, and could be incorporated into it without manifest incongruity of style.

Against a theory which involves so many literary difficulties as this we have to set the theory which, while not disputing that there may be many minor corruptions and interpolations in a poem which has come down from such primitive antiquity, yet maintains that substantially it is the

¹ It is marvellous that Professor Jebb, with his fine literary taste, should have taken 'the grand style' as equivalent to 'the Ionian style of heroic epos.' They are no more equivalent than 'the grand style' and the Elizabethan style of drama are necessarily equivalent. It is not often that one can say that Massinger or Marston has the grand style, but they certainly have the Elizabethan style.

work of a single poet. We know now from recent archaeological discoveries that at a very early date—probably before the Dorian invasion of Greece—there was an age of considerable refinement and widespread culture. In or upon the edge of this age we should place the primitive Homer. There is no need to deny the pre-existence of lays dealing with the Trojan war, though it may be observed that long poems are not the mark of a late age, but of an early one; it is the modern reader, not the ancient listener, who wants to have his poetry cut short. There may, however, have been lays relating to Diomedes, to Agamemnon, to Ajax, and these may have supplied the author of the *Iliad* with the substance of parts of his poem, as the various French and Welsh stories of King Arthur supplied Sir Thomas Malory with the material of his great epic in prose. But only with the substance; the poetry as it stands now is Homer's, not the incorporation of an earlier poet's work. The poem, when completed, won a great popularity. It would be recited on winter evenings or at times of festival in the courts of Achæan chiefs; and at a later time, about the eighth century, other poets composed epics, such as the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad*, to carry on and complete the narrative of Homer. The *Iliad* was probably preserved in manuscripts, existing not for publication, but to refresh the rhapsodist's memory. But this method of preservation would not ensure verbal accuracy. Copies would tend to differ in different cities and countries; and since the various cantos into which the poem is easily divided would be written, for the sake of convenience and handiness, on different rolls, it might be that the order of the books would be confused. To remedy this corruption of the text it is easy to suppose that some powerful ruler of cultivated tastes, whether Pisistratus, as the late legend affirms, or another, may have caused copies to be collated and so have brought into existence the first *literary* edition of the poem; and this, circulated by copyists and backed by the name of a leading state, would be accepted as the norm, before which the minor divergencies of other versions would tend to give way, though there is evidence (from the Alexandrine writers and from the early fragment of the *Iliad* found among the Petrie papyri, and containing lines unknown to the vulgate text) that they did not give way at once or altogether. At this period some large passages, popularly but wrongly attributed to Homer, may have been incorporated into the text, such as the Catalogue or the Doloneia; but any general recasting of the poem in order to introduce

alien passages at the cost of the dislocation of the existing text is in the highest degree improbable.

It is not pretended that there are no difficulties in the way of this view ; but it is maintained that, on a comparison of probabilities, it does far less violence to literary verisimilitude than its rival. And that is the question which has ultimately to be decided by the general taste of those who can both read and appreciate the poems. The men of letters have as good a right to be heard as the scholars ; for, if they are liable to ignore the evidence of minute details, the students of these details are apt to become blinded to the wider aspects of the question, for which literary taste and historical sense are needful. Mr. Lang is well within his rights when he says—

‘They who pry into the inconsistencies of this or that passage, they who actually have a professional motive, and a name among the learned to win by discovering a slip or blunder, are as remote as mortals can be from the position of Homer’s original hearers. For them, for warriors, he sang, not for spectacled young German critics on their promotion.’¹

We have no space for further elaboration of the point, but one final aspect of the question may be presented in conclusion. Is the poem better or worse for the additions which, on the separatist theory, have converted the primary *Achilleid* into the *Iliad* which we know? Wilamowitz has the courage of his opinions and maintains that it is worse ; ‘if he made the *Patrocleia* or the *Λύτρη*, he was a great poet, but if he made our *Iliad* he was a *Flickpoet*—a botcher.’² But on that ground we are content to meet even this distinguished critic, and to leave the decision to the literary taste of the cultivated world. Few passages in the *Iliad*, if any, are finer or more famous than the parting of Hector and Andromache, the speeches in the ninth book, the visit of Priam to Achilles, and the lamentation of the women over Hector dead. Yet these are all among the ‘later additions,’ as also are the two familiar passages which Tennyson selected for translation, the Trojan bivouac before the Greek wall and the shout of Achilles across the trench. The interpolators who added these scenes have increased the greatness of the original poem. But this is a phenomenon absolutely unknown to literature. We can recall no instance where the great work of a great poet (and such admittedly is the sup-

¹ *Homer and the Epic*, p. 119.

² Quoted *ib.* p. viii, from *Homer. Untersuch.* p. 380.

posed *Achilleid*) has been made greater, or even maintained equally great, when rehandled by a later writer. *The Tempest* and *Paradise Lost* were thus rehandled, and by a great poet; but we could never hear that they gained by the process. *Christabel* has been continued and Chaucer recast; but neither continuation nor modernization has been accepted as a valuable addition to our literature. If we are to believe in a literary miracle of this magnitude in connection with the *Iliad*, we must ask for greater *à priori* probability, and greater actual evidence for it than any that has yet been adduced.

We have left ourselves no room to deal with the problems of the *Odyssey*; but there is less need, on many grounds. The criticisms which have been directed against its unity rest almost entirely on small points of detail, with which it would be quite impossible to deal in the space of an article. There are no broad lines of possible division, such as have been discussed in the case of the *Iliad*. Indeed, it may safely be said that if there had been no dissection of the *Iliad* no one would have found any cause to dismember the *Odyssey*. It was inevitable, however, that the critical methods of Wolf and his successors should be extended to the sister poem, and Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz have misdirected their talents to discover traces of re-handling and incorporation of alien matter. The chief result of their efforts has been to weaken the case against the *Iliad* by discrediting the methods upon which it is founded. We cannot follow Mr. Lang in his amusing summary of the objections which have been laboriously compiled by these critics and their fellows. The only large portion of the poem which can be hewn off it without immediate destruction of the epic's course is that which relates the adventures of Telemachus in the first four books. But it would go hard with most story-tellers if they were forbidden to combine a subordinate interest with the main one, especially when it has so intimate a connection with the general plot as it has here. Moreover it is ridiculous to suppose that these books are derived from an original *Telemachia*, since no one would take so uninteresting a character as Telemachus for the central hero of an epic. It is unnecessary, however, to argue the question at length. If the *Iliad* can be defended, the *Odyssey* will stand of itself. Many of the most ardent dissectors of the former, from Wolf to Mr. Leaf, are fully persuaded of the unity of the latter; and though Mr. Lang's chapters on the *Odyssey* will be found to throw much light on the edifying methods of the advanced

criticism, he might almost have spared himself the trouble of pointing out their inconsistencies and foolishnesses. Truly if inconsistencies are a sign of interpolation there have been many interpolators at work on the lucubrations of the destructive critics.

The substantial unity of the *Odyssey* can be left to take care of itself. It is more difficult to speak with certainty as to its identity of authorship with the *Iliad*. There is unquestionably a certain difference in tone, easier felt than described; but we should be slow to say that it is more than can be accounted for by the difference of subject and of the period of the poet's life, since in any case several years must separate the birth of the *Iliad* from the birth of the *Odyssey*. The difference is hardly greater than that between the earlier and the later poems of Chaucer, between *Comus* and *Samson Agonistes*, or than that between almost contemporary poems of Keats, such as *Hyperion* and *St. Agnes' Eve*. The same causes, and especially the advancing age of the poet, may account for the increased spirituality in the conception of divine interventions which Professor Jebb notices as a mark of the *Odyssey*. More serious are the divergencies in actual mythology, such as the appearance of Helios as god of the sun in the *Odyssey*, and the substitution of Hermes for Iris as messenger of the gods. There are also certain differences in grammar and metrical usage which are too minute to discuss here, but which are collectively weighty. It should be observed, however, that the division of authorship on these grounds depends on the dismemberment of the *Iliad*, since the critics who insist upon them also declare that the 'later' books of the *Iliad*, notably the ninth and twenty-fourth, are akin to the *Odyssey* in these respects. Consequently, if these books are reclaimed for the original poet of the *Iliad*, the connection between the two poems is drawn much closer. No stress can be laid on the ancient tradition of unity of authorship, since that tradition embraced other poems which no one now attributes to Homer, such as the *Hymns*, the *Cypria*, the *Epigoni*, the *Margites*, and others. A stronger objection is based on the improbability of the co-existence of two poets so akin in style and each so supreme. It is true that the authors are not supposed to have been contemporaneous; but if the poems were known to be by different authors it would certainly be admitted that the general resemblance was extraordinary. Still, with the examples of Æschylus and Sophocles, of Sophocles and Euripides, of Racine and Corneille, and (though less alike in

style) of Goethe and Schiller, Scott and Byron, it would be rash to assert positively that two great poets of similar styles could not have been produced within a period of two or three generations. It is quite another matter to admit the prodigality of kindred genius required by the separatist theories of the *Iliad*. On the whole the matter must remain in doubt. The hypothesis of a divided authorship does not involve the extreme improbabilities which are inseparable from the dismemberment of the poems themselves. On the other hand the division is not absolutely necessitated by the evidence which is available.

It is hard to keep within bounds a discussion of the Homeric question. It is a testimony to the undying interest of the poems—undying at least so long as the advance of education allows us to learn Greek—that the controversy arouses feelings, especially in the defenders of Homeric unity, which are keen almost to bitterness. Even the critics must feel, as Wolf admitted that he felt, that it is an immense relief to drop for a while considerations of unity and authenticity, and to enjoy once more in their entirety the old *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. As Hume's annihilating scepticism deserted him when he left his study, so the thought of rhapsodist and diaskeuast disappear in the roll of the hexameter. Still to the end of time we see Helen sweep past the Trojan elders to the Scæan gate, and Andromache part with foreboding from her husband, and both utter their lament over the body of their dead hero in words which speak for ever the eulogy of the soldier without fear and without reproach. Still the battle at the wall stirs the blood of him that reads, as Ajax alone stems the tide of Trojan victory, and Sarpedon heartens Glaucus for the fight. And the glow of all romance is round the story of the *Odyssey*. The Lotos-eaters and the Cyclops, the blameless Phæacians and the overweening suitors, the return of Odysseus and the last great battle in the hall, are part of the inalienable heritage of the ages. Feelings are more than arguments, stronger certainly, and often truer; and we shall not lightly surrender the poetry which is the beginning of literature for every civilized nation of to-day to a fortuitous mob of undistinguished and unintelligent rhapsodists.

SHORT NOTICES.

Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography. By EDWARD MAUNDE THOMPSON, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., 1893.)

AMIDST the number of books which the reviewer is prepared to criticize with impartiality there comes every now and then one in which he is tempted to indiscriminate praise or blame. The volume before us is, at any rate so far as its author is concerned, one in which the temptation to lavish praise is well-nigh irresistible. It is true that there are here and there misprints which have escaped correction: it is true also that one would wish here and there for a different arrangement, but that, after all, is a matter of individual opinion. And yet, granted that the book is in its proper place in the International Scientific Series, of which it forms one volume; granted also that the letterpress and illustrations alike have a sufficiently good *mise en scène*, and we have done with criticism.

The subject of Palæography covers a long range of time. We are taken back in this book to the 'oldest hieroglyphic inscription,' now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, found on a tablet erected to the memory of a priest who lived in the reign of Sent, a monarch of the Second Dynasty, whose period has been variously given as 4000 or 4700 B.C. One of the letters on this, 'n,' has descended, and finds a place in our alphabet. This is not the earliest date to which we are referred, for 'we may without exaggeration allow a longer period, and be within bounds if we carry back the invention of Egyptian writing to six or seven thousand years before Christ,' seeing that the hieroglyphic characters are a development of picture-writing. Mr. Maunde Thompson's object in this retrospect is to give a brief account of the derivation of the Greek and Latin alphabets from the Egyptian through the Phœnician. On the initial difficulty of establishing a connection between the Egyptian and Semitic alphabets little is said, though the difficulties arising from the differences in the names of the letters, in their appearance, and in their order are not wholly passed over. We need not stop over the steps by which the 'chain of connection has, beyond reasonable doubt, been completed.' When we come to consider the Semitic alphabet—adopted, perhaps, by the Hyksos when driven out of Egypt—the most ancient form is preserved in inscriptions dating back to the tenth century B.C., the best known of which is the famous Moabite Stone, on which are recorded the doings of that Mesha, King of Moab, to whom reference is made in the Second Book of Kings. This Phœnician alphabet the Greeks acquired 'at least as early as the ninth century B.C.' Of course it received additions and modifications, new letters being added to represent new sounds, and some, especially the sibilants, causing difficulty to the historian of the alphabet. Different localities, again, had their own special idiosyncrasies.

The Greek writing followed the Semitic in going from right to left; the next step was that form known as *Boustrophedon*, in which the

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. LXXIV.

KK

written lines run alternately from right to left, and from left to right. Finally, it all went from left to right, and with this the forms of the letters also underwent a similar change, as can be seen from the first of Mr. Maunde Thompson's tables of alphabets. In this table we have before us the Egyptian, Phœnician, Greek and Latin alphabets. The Latin alphabet is traced to a primitive alphabet of the Chalcidian type, the introduction being made at a time when the Greeks still wrote from right to left, 'as early as the eighth or ninth century B.C., and not improbably through the ancient Chalcidian colony of Cumæ.' The Latin alphabet became dominant among the other alphabets of Italy, such as the Faliscan, Etruscan, Umbrian, and Oscan, in consequence of the political supremacy of Rome.

From a brief sketch of the origin of the Greek and Latin alphabets the author goes on to discuss the different materials used for writing. This we must pass over, reminding ourselves, however, of the important part which the choice of materials played in the various forms assumed by the separate letters. This is followed by a chapter on the various writing implements, and another on the forms of books, with the transition from the roll to the *codex*. In this last chapter we learn how the *quires*—or four folded sheets—were numbered, and then how 'the practice of numbering the leaves of the quires, e.g. Ai, Aii, Aiii,' began in the fourteenth century, catch-words to connect the quires together appearing but rarely in the eleventh century, and becoming common in the twelfth; how ruling with the lead-point came into ordinary use in the eleventh century, and coloured ink in the fifteenth; how words were written without any break between them; how the hyphen appears in the eleventh century; how punctuation and division into paragraphs, and the use of breathings and accents came into existence. The next chapter deals with stichometry, a subject which has recently drawn to itself a certain amount of attention, and with different forms of shorthand. This last practice is referred back at least to the fourth century B.C., and we learn also how 'a system of shorthand was practised by the early Christians for taking down sermons and the proceedings of synods.' Under this head the so-called *Tironian notes* and various methods of cryptography are included. One of the great practical difficulties which have to be faced in reading manuscripts arises from the use of abbreviations and contractions in writing, and to this subject the last of what we may call the preliminary chapters is devoted. This practice goes back to a very early date, but the degree to which it is used varied with the subject or purpose of the manuscript. Many of the most important of such abbreviations and contractions are given, but after all it is just here that a little practice will be more helpful than many pages of directions. The next five chapters deal with Greek palæography, and trace the history of Greek manuscripts, and the forms of letters found in them, from the earliest papyri, through the uncial and cursive hands as found in vellum manuscripts, down to manuscripts of the sixteenth century. Here we may notice the method employed, which is to take short facsimiles of characteristic manuscripts and to use them as a text for the accompanying

letterpress. No method could be more helpful to the students, especially as there is appended to each facsimile a literal transliteration into ordinary Greek of the foregoing extract. Mr. Maunde Thompson insists on the fact that from the earliest times of which we have documentary evidence, i.e. the third century B.C., 'we have side by side two classes of Greek writing: the literary or book hand, in which works of literature were usually (but not always) written, and the cursive hand of every-day life.' These two classes of writing are treated separately down to the 'adoption of the minuscule as a literary hand in the ninth century.' Contrasted with the minuscule is the earlier majuscule, which may be divided into *capitals*, or angular letters, and *uncials*, in which curves are introduced 'as being more readily inscribed with the pen on soft material, such as papyrus.' The important points which Mr. Maunde Thompson aims at making clear are, firstly, the characteristic forms of the letters at different times; and secondly, the way in which the later forms grew out of the former. In connection with this last point, the transition from the book hand, as found on papyri, to that used on vellum manuscripts, is illustrated from a papyrus dating at the end of the first century A.D. For illustrating the *cursive* Greek writing, much material exists from the middle of the third century B.C. onwards. Mr. Maunde Thompson follows the division of it into three groups—the Ptolemaic, the Roman, and the Byzantine. 'Roughly the Ptolemaic comprises documents down to about the end of the first century B.C.; the Roman those of the first three centuries of the Christian era; and the Byzantine those of later date' (p. 132). The last facsimile of a cursive papyrus is an imperial letter dated 756, in which we have 'the prototype of the minuscule literary hand of the ninth century.' Before passing on to writing on vellum, Mr. Maunde Thompson summarizes his results in a few general remarks. He points out the 'natural tendency to slackness and flourishing as time went on,' and shows how the shapes of the letters were affected by the natural tendency of a cursive writer to link together his letters, and how certain letters might easily become confused, and those letters, which in their more familiar form seem little capable of confusion. The whole is appropriately closed by a table of alphabets, enabling us to see at a glance the successive modifications which each letter underwent. In the chapter on uncial writing on vellum we get small facsimiles of several important Biblical manuscripts, but with rare exceptions it did not last beyond the ninth century. The minuscule, which drove it out of the field, was 'nothing more than the cursive writing of the day written with care.' In this we find the original capital forms in some cases preserved in use, and, as before, a decadence from the beautiful hands of the ninth and tenth centuries to the execrable characters of the fifteenth.

The history of Latin palæography which follows requires a more complicated division. As in the Greek the forms are subdivided into capitals—square and rustic—and uncials. The latter leads on to the modifications of uncial writing, partly uncial and partly minuscule, and the later half-uncial. Then we follow the Roman cursive,

with the various national hands derived from it—the Lombardic, the Visigothic, and Merovingian, down to the Carolingian reform, which practically made one style dominant, though that, too, had its variations with varying circumstances. Through all this we cannot here follow the author. One sentence of general interest may be quoted:—

‘The fact that a large proportion of the surviving MSS. in capital letters of the best class contain the works of Virgil points to the same conclusion as that suggested by the discovery of comparatively so many copies of the *Iliad* of Homer in early papyri, and by the existence of the Bible in three of the most important Greek vellum codices which have descended to us, namely, that a sumptuous style of production was, if not reserved, at least more specially employed, for those books which were the great works of their day.’

As early as the fifth century we find cursive forms side by side with uncial, and the minuscule element asserted itself so strongly as to form the development known as half-uncial, which was soon adopted as a book hand. Of this the manuscript of Hilary, *De Trinitate*, is an early example. Of Roman cursive writing some of the earliest specimens come from Pompeii; later ones are found in the Dacian tablets of the second century. From this cursive hand were derived the three national hands—the Lombardic, Visigothic, and Merovingian—belonging to Italy, Spain, and France, the last of which led on to the famous Caroline minuscule, a hand developed at Tours under the rule of Alcuin. A special chapter is devoted to the Irish writing, which was based on the Roman half-uncial, in which character probably were written the manuscripts brought from Rome by Roman missionaries, on which the Irish hand was modelled. The influence of this hand was widespread on the Continent in consequence of the missionary zeal of the Irish monks; and in England, too, it practically was of almost universal adoption. We cannot follow the development of Latin palæography through the steps by which the writing passed ‘from the broad, simple style in the early periods through stages of more artificial calligraphy to eventual degeneration from their first standards.’ The characteristics of each century are summed up successively. In the eleventh century lies ‘the period in which the handwritings of the different countries of Western Europe, cast and consolidated in the new mould, began to assume their several national characters, and which may be said to be the starting-point of the modern hands which employ the Roman alphabet’ (p. 265). The twelfth century was the ‘period of large books and of forms of handwriting on a magnificent scale. The scribes of the several countries of Western Europe seem to have vied with each other in producing the best types of book-writing of which they were capable’ (p. 269). ‘The change from the grand style of the twelfth century to the general minuteness of the thirteenth is very striking.’ In the fourteenth century, ‘as if wearied by the exactness and rigidity of the thirteenth century, handwriting now becomes more lax—the letters fall away in beauty of shape, and . . . degenerate into an imitative hand’ (p. 275). In the fifteenth century mediæval minuscule book-writing practically

disappears, the end of that period being interesting, because we then meet with 'those different styles of handwriting which were so markedly peculiar to the several countries of Western Europe, and which formed the models for the types of the early printers' (p. 280). Amongst these models we may notice especially two, (1) that of Northern and Eastern France, 'a heavy, sloping, and pointed hand,' such as we are familiar with from the earliest German printed books; and (2) that of the Italian Renaissance, a revival of the style of the eleventh or twelfth century, which was adopted by the early Italian printers.

The concluding chapters deal with English manuscripts and charter-hand, and with that found in the documents issuing from the Papal and Imperial Chanceries. The volume ends with a list of the principal palæographical works referred to, and an indication of two places where full lists of such works may be found and the student may be kept fully informed of such new books as appear. This last reference is especially important and useful, and as the articles in question are from the pen of Professor Wattenbach, no further commendation is necessary.

If any stimulus were needed to the ever-increasing interest which is being taken in the study of palæography, it would be found in the pursuit of the study with the guidance of such a handbook as the one we have been noticing. It ought to be found in the hands of every student, young and old, whether of classical or theological literature; and the learned world owes a debt of gratitude to the writer for the way in which he has put his stores of knowledge on this subject so clearly and so fully in the hands of everyone.

Anecdota Oxoniensia. Semitic Series, vol. i. part v. 'The Palestinian Version of the Holy Scriptures.' Five more Fragments. Edited, with Introduction and Annotations, by G. H. GWILLIAM, B.D. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.)

THE Palestinian Version here referred to is one of the various forms in which the Syriac translation of the Bible has come down to us. The relation between these forms must be considered in many respects unsettled, though something has been done by the accurate verbal studies of Syriac scholars to determine this point. The most important question in this connection is the relationship in the Gospels of the Curetonian and Peshitto. The fragments under notice, however, belong to a version later than either of these, and from a comparison with the Peshitto and Harklean Mr. Gwilliam decides that the fragments belong to a 'version made at a different epoch, amid other surroundings, by other hands.' And not only is the translation independent as a Syriac version, it also 'bears an independent witness to a class of Greek documents which exhibited a form of text in part eclectic, in part distinguished by peculiar readings.' The fragments now published consist of five leaves, and are palimpsest, the upper writing being a Hebrew cursive of the twelfth century, the only interest of which lies in the unusual fact of its being a portion of the Mishna copied on writings of Christian

scribes. The original writing consists of the Syriac version of some verses from the fourth and fifth chapters of the Book of Numbers and small fragments from the Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, and Titus. The great difficulty which the editor must have found in reading the Syriac text in the present state of the fragments is at once apparent from the beautiful collotypes prefixed. It will not be of general interest to follow Mr. Gwilliam all through his careful introduction, in which he describes the form of the fragments, gives reasons for assigning these fragments to the Palestinian version, and, finally, after weighing the evidence for the date which may be deduced from the text, proceeds to discuss the character of the translations in the fragments. It will suffice to say that the date assigned is for four leaves 'not later than the eighth century,' and for the fifth (which belonged to a different manuscript) a little later date; and that in regard to the character of the translation Mr. Gwilliam is of opinion that the Old Testament fragment is *not* a revision of the Peshitto, for while the resemblance to the Peshitto is certainly striking, 'the influence of the Hebrew is so apparent that it is impossible that the version could have assumed its present form without some reference to the Hebrew original.' To the conclusions arrived at in regard to the character of the New Testament fragments we have already alluded. These conclusions can be tested by the reader for himself by means of the arrangement in three columns of fragments from the Peshitto, Harklean, and the newly-edited text; and also by the help of Mr. E. N. Bennett's examination of the type of Greek text suggested by these fragments. Next follows a list of Palestinian and other words and forms, and some careful notes on the Syriac text. The volume concludes with this text and an English translation in parallel columns. An interesting question connected with the New Testament fragments is, whether the original manuscript from which these leaves were taken was a lectionary or contained a complete text of St. Paul's Epistles. This question Mr. Gwilliam examines with the care displayed throughout, and comes to the conclusion that the rubric inserted at 1 Thessalonians iv.—*Lesson the Second: Kephalon of Inclination*—is no proof that we have *only* a lectionary, especially in view of the colophon appended to Colossians indicating 'a transcript of something more than a set of lessons.' This little book is another of the careful bits of work which are being produced on the versions of the Bible, and we can congratulate both the editor and the Clarendon Press on the scholarly editing and the beautiful 'get-up' of the volume.

Le Recueil Général des Inscriptions Latines (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum) et l'Épigraphie Latine depuis 50 ans. Par J. P. WALTZING. (Louvain, 1892.)

ALL who are interested in the history and results of the study of inscriptions will welcome this book by Professor Waltzing of Liège, and it will also be found useful by those who wish to make a commencement in this field of inquiry. The author begins by emphasizing the usefulness of the study of epigraphy, and compares the

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum to vast stone-cutters' yards, where the materials for workmen are brought together. The vastness, indeed, is apparent to any one familiar with the ponderous volumes, and we are told that the work amounts to twenty volumes, and will contain 125,000 inscriptions. It is certainly well that, as in the work before us, we should have some account of the way in which this vast store has been accumulated, and its manifold uses. As to the last point, it is hardly possible to mention any department of ancient history which has not received fresh or fuller light from the study of inscriptions. The position of the working classes with their trades-unions, the various ceremonies of private life, the details of imperial administration, the financial, military, and religious administration, the constitution of *municipia* and colonies—all these are given as instances in which the study of epigraphy has been useful. One case is worth special notice. 'The inscriptions of Africa have been,' we are told, 'a veritable revelation for the knowledge of the legion.' The way in which this revelation has been worked out may be seen from M. Cagnat's book, published since this little volume of M. Waltzing appeared, on the Roman army in Africa. Again, it is pointed out how inscriptions have explained and supplemented the statements of ancient historians, how they have thrown light on historical geography, 'the limits of provinces and their subdivisions, the site of destroyed towns, the line of Roman roads, . . . and a crowd of other details of physical, political, military, and economic geography' (p. 15). The philologist again has his share in the rich harvest. As an instance of this, too, we can quote a book published recently. In M. Hübner's *Monumenta Linguae Ibericae* we get an instance of the use to which the researches in the field of epigraphy may be put. This has an especial and immediate value for students of the history of the Vulgate for example, for it is by the study of peculiar forms that we can localize particular manuscripts, and so thread our way back to the earlier history of that version.

Such are some of the many advantages which may be derived from a study of the inscriptions. M. Waltzing passes on to show how this study has attained the place it now holds, and this he does especially in connexion with the history of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. The collection of Latin inscriptions had begun as early as the sixteenth century, but the first who formed the conception of a universal collection was Scaliger. By the close of the eighteenth century Séguier had drawn up an alphabetical list of more than 50,000 inscriptions already published, but his catalogues cost him twenty-five years' labour.

These earlier collections erred both by defect and excess, and were based sometimes on secondhand information, often incorrect. Many, again, found their way into these collections which were forged, sometimes for the honour of making a great discovery, sometimes to increase the personal importance of the finder, or sometimes to support a pet theory. Some of these forgers were eminent, as, for example, Pirro Ligorio of Naples, who lived towards the end of the

sixteenth century, and enriched the list of inscriptions by some thousands, almost all false. The detection which followed these and other forgeries was itself followed by a reaction to excessive credulity, and in 1852 Mommsen writes, 'Hodie iacent inscriptiones Latinae confusæ atque omni genere fraudis et erroris inquinatæ.' It is to Mommsen, following in the lines laid down by certain earlier epigraphists, as Maffei, Marini, and Borghesi, that we owe the changed condition of the study to-day.

We cannot follow in detail, with M. Waltzing, the history of the various plans prior to the great *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and the reasons of their failure from insufficient workers, or insufficient funds, or any of the many obstacles that arise in such undertakings. One great problem was the plan on which the arrangements should be made, and finally the geographical method was adopted. Mommsen, Henzen, and De Rossi are the three great names connected with the work, the first named being 'the chief and soul of the enterprise.' From 1854 onwards one can follow year by year the reports made to the Academy on the great undertaking, and mark the new workers, as Wilmanns and Renier and Cagnat. The war between France and Germany broke up the combination, and Renier was released from his obligations in connexion with the *Corpus*, and the result is that though we have had three volumes from Le Blant on the *Christian* inscriptions of Gaul, the pagan ones are still uncollected. The limit of the texts to be included, the means to be adopted in collecting material, the separating of the false from the true, the general principles of arrangement of each inscription, and the order of the whole—these were the main preliminary problems. The final solution of them, and the efforts to make the contents of each volume readily accessible, M. Waltzing describes. Finally, we are taken rapidly through the contents of each volume, so as to get a bird's-eye view of the whole. The sum total of the fifteen volumes, which had appeared when the book under notice was published, was 96,538 genuine and 9,299 forged figures, which show at once the vastness of the work, and the need of its being done. But the work will never be complete. 'The different volumes are incomplete before they appear.' To remedy this deficiency the Berlin Academy began in 1871 the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, which gives, with notes, a selection of the most important new inscriptions discovered. Besides this publication, the student of epigraphy is kept up to date by many other works, such as Cagnat's *L'Année Epigraphique*, or such articles as that which appeared in the *Revue de l'Art Chrétien* for November 1892. Truly, epigraphy, as M. Waltzing says in his concluding sentences, is a new and rich mine which thousands of workers are engaged in exploring. It is a mine, too, as full of interest for the student of Christian history as for any other student. This is abundantly proved by even the slightest reference to the work of De Rossi in connexion with Christian inscriptions in Italy, or of Hübner and Le Blant in Spain and France respectively. To this last-named addition to our information we hope to return in a later number. Meanwhile, let us thank M. Waltzing for his timely

reminder of the debt of gratitude which all students owe to Professor Mommsen and his helpers in this vast undertaking. In conclusion, we may perhaps be allowed to commend to those who do not know it M. Cagnat's *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, the second edition of which appeared a year or two ago.

Foundations of Sacred Study. Five Addresses by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, author of *Christus Compromissor*, &c. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1893.)

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has this year, as in former years, published as a book the substance of his charge. We have again to thank him for a very timely and useful work. The subject of it is the present condition of religious education among the upper and middle classes, and the need of theological study on the part of the clergy, if they are to fulfil their duty with regard to it.

We could wish it had been possible for Bishop Ellicott to speak less gloomily of the present state of affairs. To teach children the Catholic Faith is one of the chief duties of the Church. It is a duty which would not be properly discharged merely by any system of religious instruction in elementary schools, however perfect. Even if the teaching in such schools was a great deal more thorough and vigorous and practically useful than in many cases it now is, it would only supply one part of the religious education which it is right to provide. As the clergy would fail in their duty if, for the sake of the educated and well-to-do, they should neglect the poor and the ignorant, so the children of all classes of society have a claim on their work and care. The responsibility of securing and giving religious instruction does not rest upon the clergy alone. Christian parents are bound to do all that is in their power for the training of their children. While in most cases there is much which can be done best through others, there is much also in which what is chiefly valuable is a father's authority and a mother's love.

If, then, it is true that there have been grave 'shortcomings' (p. 23) in this matter on the part of the clergy, and that there is a 'decline in the home teaching of religion in the upper and middle classes' (p. 19), there is need of very serious consideration what steps should be taken to remedy this evil. And we advise any who may doubt the existence of the evil to read Bishop Ellicott's introductory address, and to look up the passages in the various reports to which he there refers.

In beginning to discuss the remedy Bishop Ellicott mentions the resolutions passed by the House of Laymen in the Province of Canterbury, two years ago, calling the attention of the parochial clergy to the subject, and 'to the urgent need of increased care being bestowed on the upper and middle classes in reference "to the sacred duty of instructing their children in religious knowledge"' (p. 21), and asks two questions:—

'Are the parochial clergy . . . willing to undertake what the voice of

our representative laity calls them to do? And if so, are they, speaking generally, able and fully qualified to do it?' (pp. 23-4).

The Bishop sees reason for questioning the willingness of the clergy to do this work. While he notices 'greatly diffused earnestness' in the English Church, and especially in the clergy, 'multiplied' 'services,' 'increased' 'spiritual organisations,' 'largely developed' 'pastoral work,' he infers from 'statistics' that 'the number of' the clergy 'who regularly visit their schools and take some part in the religious teaching is declining rather than increasing,' and points out that 'as year follows year' 'the level of religious knowledge' 'among the students' in 'our training colleges' 'is still patently falling,' and ascribes this 'falling level' partly to the fact 'that the number of students who as pupil teachers' receive 'instruction from the clergy is not only small, but declining,' having been 'in 1890' '32 per cent.; in 1891, 29 per cent.; in 1892, 25 per cent.' (pp. 24-6). It is difficult to avoid the Bishop's inference that this neglect of instruction in the elementary schools and of pupil teachers is not an encouraging sign as to the desire of the clergy to be teachers, and that

'a large amount of apathy will have to be overcome before the resolutions of the House of Laymen can adequately be carried out' (p. 27).

He questions also 'the full power' (p. 27) of the clergy to do the needed work of raising 'the whole standard of religious education' (p. 29), and emphasizes the increased 'attention' which 'must be given to the teaching of doctrine if our clergy are to be' 'leaders of religious thought at a time like the present, when guidance, especially in the case of the educated classes, is more urgently needed than ever' (p. 31). This brings the Bishop to the main subject of the charge, the systematic study of theology by the clergy.

We desire to express our gratitude for the two addresses on the study of Holy Scripture. In the multiplicity of theological writings of the present day there is a great danger lest even those who study will bestow too little thought on the Bible. Nor is it easy for those who do not neglect the Bible to make the best use of the time they give to it. Bishop Ellicott speaks emphatically of the necessity and usefulness of 'studious reading of Holy Scripture, as far as possible at a settled time, and on a carefully considered and steady system,' and he explains with great care what he thinks to be 'the best and most profitable method of studying the Word of God' (p. 45). On the details of the method he suggests we must not dwell. Those who know the rare helpfulness of the Bishop's Commentaries will expect to find his suggestions for study excellent, and we do not think they will be disappointed. Many a young priest or deacon, or candidate for holy orders, might form a habit of studying the Bible in a most profitable way by attention to what is here said. There are 'preliminary comments' of value (pp. 46-62), and a good statement of the 'mental attitude' required in the student (pp. 62-71); and the answer to the question what is meant by inspiration is, in our opinion, admirable.

'Inspiration is, so to speak, the direct equipment by the inflowing of

the Holy Spirit for adequately expressing in human language the truths revealed by Almighty God to the spirit of the recipient. It is thus neither, on the one hand, a simple enhancement of what may be termed general Christian illumination, nor, on the other hand, a resultant consequence of direct dictation by the Holy Spirit, but is the divinely imparted qualification to report rightly what God is pleased to move the speaker or the writer to communicate' (pp. 57-8).

We are glad, too, to notice the vindication of the use of the phrase 'Word of God' to denote both the Old and the New Testament¹ (p. 61), and the denial of the persistently repeated statement that the Bible ought to be read as any other book (pp. 86, 87).

There are two addresses on the study of Christian doctrine. In these we are chiefly struck by the recognition of the need of proportion in teaching the different parts of the Faith, and of the importance, from an evidential point of view, of the due order and arrangement of the separate doctrines which compose it. It is the harmony of the Faith which more than anything else declares its reasonableness, and the preservation of the harmony is very closely connected with the maintenance of a logical order. We think it, then, not a little valuable that the Bishop begins his dogmatic system with the doctrine of God, puts the interruption caused by sin in the right place, introduces the Incarnation in the order of Revelation as the remedy for sin, and treats the Atonement in close connexion with the Incarnation. It is a matter for real thankfulness that he should emphasize the positive reality of original righteousness,² and refer to the most valuable treatise of Bishop Bull on *The State of Man before the Fall* (pp. 147-9), that he should maintain the historical character of the Scriptural account of the Fall (pp. 149-51), refuse to give up the word 'substitution' when properly explained, in connexion with the Atonement (pp. 167-8), and point out the value of the Filioque clause in the Creed (p. 172). We have read both these addresses with the greatest interest and a very strong sense of their practical utility.

We have very little doubt that our own belief about the Incarnation is in accordance with that of the Bishop, and he will pardon us if we venture to comment upon his language in one paragraph. We always regret the introduction of the word 'Kenosis' into English theology as being a phraseology of no practical value, and likely to mislead. And we cannot say we like the sentence in which it is

¹ On a matter of detail we are not sure that Bishop Ellicott rightly understands the passage in Dr. Driver's *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament*, to which he refers in note 1 on p. 61. Dr. Driver there (*ibid.* pp. 158-60) argues that the phrase 'Word of God' ought not to be applied without some qualification to the completed books either of the Old or of the New Testament. Bishop Ellicott appears to have understood him to make a distinction in this respect between the Old and the New Testament.

² We think the distinction between the 'image of God' and the 'likeness to God' one which, for the sake of clearness, is worth maintaining. Bishop Ellicott appears (p. 147) to use 'image of God' in the sense which is technically described as 'likeness to God.'

said that our Lord 'emptied Himself of all that would have been incompatible with the assumption of a perfect but true human nature' (p. 164). It is, of course, true that our Lord in the Incarnation restricted the use of the attributes which as God He possessed ; and this, we are inclined to think, is what the Bishop means. But we cannot regard the phrase 'emptied Himself' without careful explanation as a proper translation of St. Paul's *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν* (Phil. ii. 7),¹ and the sentence we have quoted might, we fear, lead some readers to think that in the Incarnation there was a surrender, as well as a restriction in the use, of something which was Divine. And an actual surrender would imply either that the union of Godhead and Manhood was not truly personal, or that there was mutability in the Godhead itself. And while Bishop Ellicott's illustration² of what he means by the 'effect' our Lord's 'taking' human nature 'might have had on His Divine Nature' (pp. 163-4) shows there is no real disagreement between him and ourselves, we think the expression 'effect' on the Divine Nature one which, with all deference to the Bishop's high standing and great power as an orthodox theologian, it would have been well, especially with current controversies in view, to avoid. Foreign Lutheran theological writings on central truths have many great merits ; we are not without fear of them with regard to some parts of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

There is good reason for Bishop Ellicott's warning against theories of development in matter which would inevitably lead to Determinism, and of the 'conservation of all things' which 'imply any self-sufficiency on the part of Nature to maintain itself for a single moment by its own agency' (pp. 126-7). There is need of great caution and patience in any consideration of the method of the formation of the universe and its bearing on theology, and of the relation of natural laws to the action of Almighty God, but it is at least clear that any scientific theories which are necessarily deterministic, or which make natural laws, either in their origin or in their operation, independent of Divine power, are inconsistent with fundamental parts of the Christian Faith. And it is essential that the real distinction between man and the lower animals which is involved in his being created in the image of God should be carefully maintained.

We may call attention to the following statement about miracle:—

'The miracle . . . does not imply a violation of the laws of nature, but is rather a result from changes in the inner condition of forces and things, by which they pass under the domain of another law than that under which they were before the change was brought about. The effects thus become no longer ordinary but extraordinary, yet distinctly subject to law ; the change not being in the laws of nature, but in the inner condition of the things to which the required influences were imparted' (pp. 128-9).

¹ See Bishop Pearson's explanation of the phrase in his *Exposition of the Creed*, article ii.

² 'In regard of suffering, He vouchsafed to learn by experience what, as God, He could not otherwise have experimentally known' (p. 164).

There is a sense in which the laws of nature cannot be violated, and with reference to that sense the Bishop is certainly right in taking exception to the statement of Martensen,¹ to which he refers, that 'the miracle, properly speaking, implies a violation of the laws of nature.' At the same time we may not deny that there may be the interruption or suspension of some particular law of nature by direct Divine action, and if so we do not think the way of stating the matter which is here borrowed from Lotze² fully meets the case. There is no probability that the question of the relation of miracles to natural laws will ever, in our present state, be free from difficulty; in our opinion the two most helpful statements on the subject with which we have ever met are the well-known passages by St. Augustine³ and Dr. Liddon.⁴

It is with great heartiness that we are able to commend *Foundations of Sacred Study* to our readers, and especially to those who are beginning that study of Holy Scripture and Dogmatic Theology which should be to the clergy a life-long task.

Cambridge Sermons preached before the University in St. Mary's Church, 1889-1892. Selected and edited by C. H. PRIOR, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester. (London: Methuen and Co., 1893.)

A COLLECTION of Sermons delivered before the University of Cambridge by different preachers in recent years is naturally interesting. The best specimens of University Sermons represent leading features of the thought of the day, and show what, in the opinion of those who have opportunities for observation, are the needs of the audience

¹ Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, § 117.

² Lotze's *Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion*, § 62.

³ St. Augustine, *C. Faustum*, xxvi. 3: 'It is not unfitting for us to say that God does contrary to nature anything which He does contrary to that which we know in nature. For what we call nature is that order of nature which is known to us and customary, and when God does anything contrary to this His actions are called miracles or wonders. But contrary to that supreme law of nature which is outside the knowledge alike of the wicked and of those who are still weak God is as far from acting as He is from acting against Himself' ('Sed contra naturam non incongrue dicimus aliquid Deum facere, quod facit contra id quod novimus in natura. Hanc enim etiam appellamus naturam, cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturæ, contra quem Deus cum aliquid facit, magnalia vel mirabilia nominantur. Contra illam vero summam naturæ legem, a notitia remotam, sive impiorum, sive adhuc infirmorum tam Deus nullo modo facit, quam contra se ipsum non facit').

⁴ Liddon's *Elements of Religion*, pp. 73, 74: 'Miracle is an innovation upon physical law, or at least a suspension of some lower physical law by the intervention of a higher one, in the interests of moral law. . . . The Eternal Being sees the end in the beginning; He sees the exception together with the rule so simultaneously that it is untrue to say that He anticipates it. It is a simple, indivisible act of will, whereby He everlastingly wills the rule together with the exception—the exception with the rule.'

to which they are addressed. The present volume contains the work of distinguished preachers, and it was a happy idea of the editor in his work of selection to choose for the first nine Sermons such as would illustrate St. Peter's words in verses 5-7 of the first chapter of his second Epistle. This line of thought he has explained in the preface.

'He has placed first a sermon (I.) which opens out a wide range of vision, and exhorts to a self-consecrating exercise of faculties; and by the next eight sermons he has hoped to illustrate the successive steps in the development of the Christian life or its daily discipline, as seen from the standpoint of a University. These steps find expression (Sermons II. to IX.) in faith made reasonable and inspiring through the philosophy of Sonship; in virtue as exemplified and ennobled in the varied excellences of University life; in knowledge guarded from shallowness and want of sympathy through its prayer for spiritual insight; in temperance and self-control welcoming the discipline of Christian obedience to authority and Christian loyalty to duty; in patience that can pierce through difficulties by its abiding trust in God's purpose and its unflinching outlook of hope; in godliness that declares its consciousness of God's kingdom and its allegiance to its Lord and King; in love of the brethren that under present social conditions embodies in active form the principle of love; and in love that finds its energy and its consummation in the presence of the God of peace and love' (Preface, pp. iii, iv).

When we say that the first Sermon is by Bishop Westcott, and that the subject is 'The Spirit of the University,' we need hardly add that it suggests a very noble ideal. The theme of a great University leading the minds of its members to a wider vision than that of mere fragments of knowledge, and teaching them to find joy in the consecration of sacrifice and the spirit of fellowship, is one which is thoroughly congenial to the genius of the Bishop of Durham. In the eighth Sermon the Archbishop of Canterbury dwells with great power on the necessity of social work being grounded on Christian love, and in the fourth Canon Browne vigorously enforces the needed lesson that, in the pursuit of knowledge, care must be taken to train the eye of the spirit. With the rest of the first nine Sermons we confess that we are somewhat disappointed. Archdeacon Wilson's on the 'Gospel of the Sons of God' contains the true and inspiring thought of human sonship to God; but there is a noticeable forgetfulness of the distortion in human life which original sin causes, and that the sonship to God which man possesses by nature is rather the possibility of receiving the grace whereby he may attain to true sonship and service than in itself a ground of acceptable life. And language is used which is apparently meant to set aside the objectivity of the Atonement and the true view of the Faith as a deposit committed to the Church. Other Sermons contain useful and well-expressed ideas, as Archdeacon Farrar's exhortation to 'Be fearless; be fair; be true' (p. 48), Dr. Searle's emphasis on the need of submission to authority, Mr. Robinson's clear teaching that the choice of the elect in the Church is intended in the Providence of God to be of world-wide benefit (pp. 99-101), Canon Leeke's reminder that those who are to lead must themselves obey (pp. 114-16), Mr.

Moule's declaration of the need of the true worker resting within on God and His love ; but we cannot say that they strike us as having that peculiar strength which we rightly look for in University Sermons.

The remaining Sermons are five in number. The first of them, by Dr. Swete, admirably expresses the agreement of the Athanasian Creed with the Nicene Creed on the doctrine of the Trinity and the harmony of both these Creeds with the teaching of our Lord and of St. Paul. It points out that the indebtedness of the Church to Greek philosophy as regards terminology is entirely consistent with the fact that the doctrine expressed in such terminology was taught by Christ, and that the value of the 'ecclesiastical dogma' (p. 164) of the Trinity may be seen by noticing not only that 'it is the only formula which includes with scientific completeness the whole teaching of the New Testament,' but also that 'the long experience of the Church has shown that any departure from the form in which the doctrine was ultimately cast issues in the loss of some part of the truth committed to her charge' (p. 165). This valuable Sermon ends with a statement of the barrenness of Unitarianism.

'Unitarian Christianity has, in various forms, competed with the Catholic Faith ; but with what success ? It has attained and held a certain number of adherents of blameless life and keen or cultivated intellect. But among the masses it has made little way. It has had no voice for the weary and heavy-laden, for the weak and illiterate, for the outcast and the lost, for the sick and the dying. *Media vita in morte sumus* : the human spirit needs a faith which can promise to uphold it in the last conflict, whether the end comes under the form of a prolonged illness or of a lightning flash. Undogmatic Christianity cannot boast of having been, like the Catholic Church, a fruitful mother of saints. So far as experience has gone, a Christianity without an Incarnation, without an Atonement, without a Resurrection of the Body, without a Pentecost, is a Christianity denuded of its powers for the regeneration of human life. But these doctrines, so full of spiritual vitality, depend upon the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The whole fabric of the Faith which has changed the world rests on the revelation of the One Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The whole course of the Christian life is moulded by the consciousness of a threefold relationship to God. Only in the power of a Spirit who is truly the Spirit of God and yet dwells within the temple of the human body, only through the mediation of a Son who is perfect God and has been made Man, can the spirit of man return with confidence to its Father in heaven and live' (pp. 166-7).

A fine Sermon by Canon Worlledge, on the influence of Church principles on Christian character, follows. It will bear reading more than once and repay careful thought. The twelfth Sermon is by Professor Kirkpatrick on 'The Old Testament in the Christian Church.' Parts of it have previously been published in *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, a book which we reviewed in January 1892. With some of Professor Kirkpatrick's opinions about the Old Testament as indicated in that book we cannot agree, and we are obliged to dissent from expressions on p. 197 and elsewhere in the Sermon ; but by far the greater part of it appears to us to be

particularly valuable in its emphasis on the deep meaning of our Lord's saying that He came to 'fulfil' the law and the prophets (St. Matt. v. 17), and the consequent permanent authority and usefulness of the Old Testament. The three last-mentioned Sermons are, in our opinion, with the exception of that by Bishop Westcott, the most powerful which the volume contains. The last two Sermons are one on 'The Voice of the Spirit of Truth,' by Professor Ryle, and an earnest plea for a supply of the best men and the organization of community life and work for the Church abroad by Dr. Maclear.

If we may quote again from the preface, in which, with rare skill, Mr. Prior has described the principles upon which the Sermons were selected and their relation to one another, these last five Sermons

'show the characteristic attitude of the University, as expressed by her preachers, towards Christian doctrine as an enduring and living Creed; towards the Church as a living body whose principles are declared through the characters of Christian men; towards the Old Testament as a living witness fulfilled in Christ and in His Church; towards Scripture in general as a living Word illumined by the Spirit of Truth; and lastly towards missionary effort through self-sacrifice as the true evidence of living force and fruitfulness' (Preface, pp. iv, v).

Random Recollections of some Noted Bishops, Divines, and Worthies of the 'Old Church' of Manchester. By the Rev. GEORGE HUNTINGTON, M.A., Author of *John Brown the Cordwainer*, *Autobiography of an Alms Bag*, &c., &c. (London: Griffith, Farran, and Co., 1893.)

THIS is a very amusing book. The methods of keeping warm and avoiding infection of a chaplain of the 'Old Church' at Manchester, the queer ways of one of the Pembrokeshire clergy, incidents in the lives of several dignitaries, will afford most readers an opportunity for hearty laughter. This feature will make the *Recollections* a good companion on a holiday.

But to amuse is not the only purpose Mr. Huntington has in view. Among his most amusing stories we detect the wish to preserve a true idea of the characters of those whose lives he records, and to show that earnest religion and real learning sometimes lay behind ways which to the present generation are necessarily strange. This may be noticed in the concluding passage of his sketch of 'Smith of Gumfreston.'

'Such as Smith was we shall never see his like again. He belonged to a past order of things; one of those whose youth was spent before railways invaded the seclusion of the out-of-the-way places. . . . Simple in an age of ever-growing luxury, primitive in an age of pretentiousness, endowed with the power of digesting and assimilating stores of knowledge, when others skip or skim the surface of some of the numerous shallow works with which the lighter literature of the day is flooded, he never named a book he had not read, nor a subject he did not understand. . . . "Smith of Gumfreston" was not as other men are, and I venture to think it is something to rescue his name from oblivion, ere we ourselves take our journey to "the place where all things are forgotten"' (pp. 149, 150).

It comes out in, among many other places, his description of the 'Old Church' at Manchester.

'In 1847 the collegiate church became a cathedral, and the Warden and Fellows Dean and Canons. I do not suppose that the Warden and Fellows were much better or much worse than their contemporaries elsewhere. No doubt, their charter notwithstanding, a good many of them were pluralists, and accepted without reserve the good things that Providence bestowed upon them, and were duly thankful; but they were mostly men of mark, gentlemen and scholars, and Manchester was all the better for them. They caused the clerical body to be respected; they were looked up to, and they kept up a tone of Churchmanship quite unknown in towns like Liverpool and Birmingham. Besides which the presence in their midst of a stately church, in which weekly celebrations and daily choral and early Sunday services were held, was not without its effects on the lay people' (pp. 250-1).

We may notice another parallel feature. Mr. Huntington wishes the present generation to realize something of the cost at which Church privileges, which to most of us are now a matter of course, were won or preserved. There is an instance of this in a passage in his most interesting sketch of the famous Church musician Dr. Dykes.

'Dr. Dykes is, indeed, so well known for his music that few, comparatively, are aware that he was one of the most prominent confessors for the liberty in faith and ritual of the Church of England, for he not only, as has just been stated, had the honour to be singled out for prosecution by the Church Association, but to be condemned without a hearing by Archbishop Tait in the House of Lords, on introducing the now exploded Public Worship Regulation Act. It was also with reference to St. Oswald's that Lord Beaconsfield delivered himself of his alliterative pun of "Mass in Masquerade." . . . Many a sensitive spirit besides Dykes quailed before the storm of misrepresentation and actual persecution. The Bishop, alas! took the course, then only too common, of trying to reduce a contumacious clergyman to obedience to his own episcopal interpretation of the law, founded on Privy Council findings, by refusing to license him a curate, thus making the parish suffer for the mistakes, real or supposed, of the incumbent. The saintly Vicar of St. Oswald's held on single-handed, never giving up one service, visiting his flock morning, noon, and night, and administering ghostly counsel and advice to all who applied to him, till health and strength gave way. His last cry of grief was expressed in the touching conclusion of his letter, "Da pacem, Domine"' (pp. 241-3).

Parallel, again, is the attempt to vindicate the episcopate of Bishop Prince Lee. Mr. Huntington has much that is good to say of Bishops Fraser, Wilberforce, and Thirlwall, but his account of the first Bishop of Manchester reveals which of these four prelates was nearest to his heart. There is something pathetic in the very common notion that Dr. Prince Lee, after his most brilliant work as head master of King Edward's School at Birmingham, deeply influencing as it did some who have influenced most profoundly English theological thought of the present day, became Bishop of Manchester only to be a failure. Mr. Huntington, who was ordained by him, and

was for years in his diocese, is careful to defend him in some matters in which he was, in his opinion, commonly misunderstood. In what seemed to some the monotonous autocracy of the Bishop's business days he sees the accomplishment 'of an amazing amount of work' (p. 22); he calls attention to the allowance he thinks should be made for 'the curtiness of his manner,' which 'aggrieved' some, because of the fact, afterwards found out, 'that he suffered for years from painful illness' (p. 27), and gives an interesting instance of the real sympathy which underlay his stern manner. He has to acknowledge that the Bishop was not appreciated in Manchester (p. 36), but he implies that his incessant work and 'splendid' organization were of real, if insufficiently noticed, service to 'his vast diocese' (p. 29). And he concludes—

'Manchester is not the only place which has not rightly estimated its greatest men. The century is richer by such men as James Prince Lee, and all the poorer when they are taken away' (p. 36).

These *Recollections* will be of special interest to those who know Pembrokeshire or Manchester, but any who wish to realise the personalities of typical English Churchmen of the present century may do well to read them. They include notices of, besides those we have already mentioned, 'Birkett of St. Florence,' Dean Hook, Archdeacon Allen, Dr. Neale, Dean Bowers, Canon Parkinson, Canon Wray, Mr. Johnson, George Pilkington, William Andrew, Humphrey Nichols, Dr. John Boutflower.

On one point we entirely disagree with the author. He says in the 'advertisement' printed at the beginning, 'The writer flatters himself that his readers will hardly be able to guess to which theological school he belongs, or if he belongs to any.' We wish to ask him if we are wrong in surmising that he may be placed in the school of English Churchmanship, one of the best representatives of which was the late Mr. Beresford Hope.

The Son of Man among the Sons of Men. By the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ripon, Hon. D.C.L. Oxon. (London: Isbister and Co., 1893.)

THIS is a volume of sermons composed with great skill and exhibiting much spiritual insight and force. Young preachers may learn much that is useful by studying their method; those who read them for the sake of their matter will find them helpful. They are careful studies of character and contain valuable explanations of our Lord's treatment of different persons. Though they are somewhat lacking in originality, and the preacher occasionally seems to us to sacrifice thought to expression, the sermons are eminently sensible and practical, and of high moral tone. The workmanship throughout is so good and even that it is difficult to select any for special notice. That on 'Judas Iscariot,' with its theory that the traitor Apostle up to the very last wished to keep in with our Lord as well as with the priests, in case after all His should be the winning side, and that his attempted restoration of the thirty pieces of silver was merely de-

signed in order that he might be in a better position than that of a paid spy, is one of the most suggestive. That on 'Herod' brings out forcibly the meaning of our Lord's silence. Those on 'Nicodemus' and 'John the Baptist' show with special clearness our Lord's power of influencing souls of the most different types. 'Simon Peter' and 'The Restored Demoniac' contain valuable lessons on the development of character. Passing by others, we may notice the warning against yielding to the faults of natural temperament which the sermon on 'Thomas' affords, and its concluding lesson :—

'It is part of our life's struggle to vanquish temperament. The victory of life is not over circumstances alone : it must be a victory over what we are as well as over what we meet. The fight, often in its most real agony and in its profoundest meaning, is a fight against ourselves : the victory lies in rising above ourselves into the clearer region where we can think truly and clearly, no longer warped by our own temperament. As in iron vessels, our compass is often disordered by the very material of which we are wrought. It is the part of wisdom, it is the prerogative of manhood to discover these tendencies, to guard against them, to correct their influence, and to resist their tyranny. Yielded to, the temperament becomes a tyrant ; watched, fought against, planned against, it may first be subdued, and then serve as a power by the side of light, goodness, and truth. Yet not of ourselves can this victory be achieved.

'The lesson of Thomas shows us that the bias of temperament wrought a distrust of goodness and a doubt of spiritual power. By grasping the eternal forces which are outside us and within us, we may escape from the thralldom of ourselves and the tyranny of temperament. By laying hold of all that Christ is, we grasp the unchanging and eternal strength of God' (pp. 138-9).

Twilight Dreams. By the Right Rev. W. B. CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Ripon. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1893.)

THE Bishop of Ripon has published under this title a collection of very beautiful allegories, which, among other lessons, illustrate with rare force the greatness of love, the need of dwelling in the presence of God, the helpfulness of adversity, the injury to character through yielding to faults of temperament, the power of a little child to heal division, banish discontent, remove despair, solace sorrow, and transform character, and thus recall the work of the Holy Child, the danger of isolation, the necessity of guarding against self-delusion. They are devised with an ingenuity, and told with a grace, which make the book pleasant reading, and there can be few who can read and think about it without being reminded of valuable spiritual truths. In some cases the Bishop leaves his story to point its own moral, but we may quote the earnest words with which he draws out part of the teaching of 'Dives dreams' :—

'There is one delusion to which all our life here is painfully and habitually liable. The things we see take strong and tremendous hold upon us. It is vain that we utter to ourselves the oft-repeated truth, These things are nothing.

"This world's a dream, and all things show it."

For, when we come under the influence of the glittering things of earth

L L 2

and society, we forget their emptiness. Ask the man who has leapt from penury to wealth if riches are indeed less than nothing, and vanity. No, he will reply, with one whose shrewd wisdom and wit are as a proverb; "I find the possession of wealth ten times more pleasant than the anticipation of it." It is all very well for us to despise what we have not ourselves; but let the magic wand of actual possession and enjoyment come across our lives, and we shall modify our language and readjust our thoughts. Let us not deceive ourselves. The fascination of the things we see is real and is felt. Nor can we shake ourselves loose of them. It needs—believe it—a light of conviction mightier than man can command to work this emancipation. Golden, flashing back the many hues of imagination, fancy, and hope, the majestic palace of worldly gain sparkles upon us, and all would feel glad to see their names enrolled among the fortunate.

'Light divine, often shining from out the storm of adversity, must show us how hollow, how dreary, how deadly are some of the principles which we readily accept. Is it true that the very framework of social life is held together by the necessary toleration of so many false practices and ignoble axioms that its fall must precede its reform? or is it not too late to hope that a more frank obedience to the spirit of Christ may yet regenerate and so save society?' (pp. 224-5.)

Classified Digest of the Records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1892. With much Supplementary Information. 8vo. (London: Published at the Society's Office, 1893.)

WE are not surprised to learn from Mr. Tucker's brief preface that this *Classified Digest* has occupied all the leisure time and all the annual holidays of the Society's archivist, Mr. Pascoe, for the space of the last five years. Even with time and pains so amply and ungrudgingly bestowed many qualities were necessary beyond those of an ordinary compiler for the production of so complete a work. The records of missionary associations have laboured, not altogether undeservedly, in bygone days under the reproach of dulness, and it needs a quick eye and an exceptional power of appreciation to gather out of a huge mass of materials such a history as is here given us without overburdening the page with one superfluous line, and yet so to enliven it with telling and vivid touches that the reader is carried on with unflagging interest to the end. Such a book is not to be dismissed with a mere hasty panegyric, and we propose, therefore, to explain its plan, and to give some idea of its contents.

The thought which inspired the *Classified Digest* in its present shape was a very happy one. The records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in the course of its honoured life of nearly two centuries, deal with every State in America, and with almost every Colonial diocese in turn. In the 'Journals' of the governing body at home, in the letters of their missionaries from their varied fields of labour, in the 'Proceedings' of Colonial Diocesan Committees, in the periodicals and publications issued from the office at Westminster from time to time there is immense store of information on the work of Church missions which, in its scattered condition, would inevitably be buried in oblivion, but which, if judiciously

condensed, would be invaluable. Questions are perpetually arising in the intense pressure of modern mission work which need all the light that past experience, often bought at a heavy cost, can cast upon them. The history of our Colonial and missionary dioceses, like Church history in general, is the best corrective to hasty impatience, to distrust or disregard of definite Church principles, to faithlessness in any of its varied forms. The trials of the present are reduced to their true proportions when placed side by side with the difficulties which our fathers faced and overcame, and scornful imputations of futility or fanaticism are seen to be but idle wind before the solid and permanent results with which their persevering, though sadly inadequate, efforts have been blessed. The one serious hindrance to the production of so indispensable a chronicle was the vast labour it would involve. How were the transactions of the Church over world-wide territories for two hundred years to be brought within the space of a single volume without sacrificing the interest which depends upon and flows from an adequate acquaintance with minute details?

Mr. Pascoe has satisfactorily solved the problem as follows: After an introductory chapter, which describes the origin, object, and first proceedings of the Society, the different quarters of the world are taken in turn, and the story of each several diocese, often of each separate mission, is related from its commencement to the close of 1891. The account of each province is headed by a brief introduction, and that of each separate district by a rapid sketch of its history down to the period when the Society began to work it. It would be hard to surpass the cunning with which these sketches are drawn. The reader comes upon some mission district—Basutoland or the Pongas or Tristan d'Acunha, names over which even a critic's omniscience may be at fault—and straightway he learns all about their position and the date of their discovery and the vicissitudes of sovereignty to which they have been subjected, and with a new zest he passes on to the story of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel's work among them. Herein, of course, lie the bulk and pith of the volume; but this is not all. The narrative of each district is followed first by a summary of statistics, which tells the extent of area and population, together with the roll of Church people, clergy, communicants, and schools, and secondly by a list of references so ample as to furnish the authority for every statement which has been advanced or quoted. Statistical tables for each province further serve to illustrate the work of the Society and its results. An appendix of ten further chapters embraces the variety of topics bound up indissolubly with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel's missions, such as the foundation and growth of the Colonial episcopate, the educational establishments under its influence, the books and translations issued from its printing presses, and the roll of its missionaries—a list including 3,693 names. A goodly stock of matter this even for the *Digest's* thousand pages.

Any truthful record of England's early Colonial Church history must be one which no Churchman can read without a sense of

burning indignation and shame. The miserable Erastianism of the Georgian era, and the bonds, often utterly illegal, by which the Church was hampered in her first efforts at expansion, inflicted injuries from which she has not even yet recovered. No wonder if Dissenters pressed before her into the mission field when the temporal powers held her back from the natural development of her system. Yet when once her fetters were broken how splendidly the Colonial Church has been served. Of course there have been failures in her efforts, and mistakes occasionally in the selection of her prelates, and the necessary abandonment at times of stations for lack of men or means. Unbroken success has never been vouchsafed to the Church from the days of the Apostles down to our own times; but, regarded in its broad sweep and tendency as recorded in the *Digest*, without any attempt to conceal defeat, and without any boasting over victories gained, Churchmen cannot but gratefully recognise the deep debt owing to the venerable Society for the work it has done in their behalf.

It is utterly impossible, within the limits of a Short Notice, even to enumerate the various fields in which the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has laboured. The Episcopal Church in the United States has more than than once publicly acknowledged her indebtedness to the Society, to whose long-continued nursing care and protection her present position is largely due. Canada and the Australian Colonies, each now taking their places as Churches mainly independent of help from the mother country, owe to her fostering and unwearied efforts their triumph over the difficulties of earlier days. We might repeat the same story of persevering sympathy and practical assistance to almost every Colony in turn, and the *Digest* shows what a stay the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel's grants have been at seasons of special distress, when but for them the work of the Church must have entirely broken down. Through what struggles the Colonial Church has had to pass, and has emerged 'more than conqueror,' is illustrated in the brief record of the diocese of Nassau. A bishopric had hardly been established in 1861 when a policy of disestablishment was adopted, and

'the thirteen years of Bishop Venables's episcopate were years of disendowment, destruction of Church property by hurricane, paralysis of trade, poverty, and considerable emigration. Yet the Church progressed. . . . In the Island of Eleuthera a man once came to the Bishop from a Baptist village to say that he had collected forty children and formed a Sunday school, and also that there were fifty persons waiting for baptism. A clergyman was sent, who baptized ninety. Some of the missions were brought to a remarkable state of efficiency, the poor black and coloured people "adopting one of the surest ways of calling down God's blessing on ourselves" by contributing to *foreign* missions. Nearly 30*l.* a year was raised in this way in one parish (p. 225).

'The cyclone of 1866, which overthrew nearly one-half of the churches in the diocese, was followed by disestablishment and disendowment in 1869. . . . With the death of Bishop Venables—the result upon a frame not naturally robust of continuous travel, irregular and often unwhole-

some food, constant care, and unceasing mental labour—the episcopal income ceased. From his death-bed he sent a message to the Society to save the diocese from being blotted out of Christendom' (pp. 225-6).

The Society's response was a guarantee of 200*l.* a year, and a contribution of 1,500*l.* towards the endowment of the see. The result of this timely help has been most encouraging. In 1845 the communicants numbered 636; in 1870, 2,215; in 1889, 4,727. In 1848 there were only 84 communicants in the out islands, and 1,077 in 1870; there are now over 5,000. An American Church missionary in 1883 said, 'The coloured people at Nassau are the best educated black people I have ever seen.'

Such a miniature sketch may serve, even in this condensed and imperfect form, to give some idea of these 'Records' of the Society's action over a world-wide field. In South Africa, where it strengthened materially the hands of the noble Bishop Gray, and enabled him to become indeed, what he was in intention, the apostle of Cape Colony and the heathen around it; in India, where it has largely fed the most successful missions in Tinnevely, the Punjaub, and Burma; in Melanesia, as the coadjutor of Bishops Patteson and Selwyn, the same story is repeated; and the reader is carried on unweariedly by the charm of the narrative. Wherever true Church work has had to be done on true Church lines the Society has been the staunchest of allies, and her wisdom has been justified of her children. The 'Record,' which embraces the history of a new mission started about every two years since its charter of 1701, makes up, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has said of it, a marvellous book, a fascinating account without a dull page.

The Temple: Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations. By GEORGE HERBERT. With Engravings after Albert Dürer, Marcantonio, Holbein, and other Artists. (London: Seeley & Co., 1894.)

AMONG the Christmas gift-books which have appeared during the last few weeks, this new edition of George Herbert's Sacred Poems deserves more than a passing comment. Type and paper are both of the highest excellence, while the binding is adorned with a beautiful design of gold arabesques on a dark-green ground, copied from a Grolier in the British Museum. But the most noteworthy feature in the book is to be found in the seventy illustrations with which its pages are enriched. The principle upon which they have been chosen is explained in a very interesting Prefatory Note, modestly signed with the initials R. S. We are here told that they are taken from engravings produced in the century before George Herbert's time, that is to say, from designs which he had seen or might have seen. The idea is a happy one, and has been admirably carried out. In many cases the prints help to explain some obscure passage or quaint metaphor in the poems, in some they would seem to have supplied the central thought. Thus, the pathetic design of Christ pointing to the wound in His side, from the *Harmony of the Gospels* printed at Little Gidding, may well have suggested Herbert's poem of 'The Bag,' while in the same way the kingly figure of the Christ

in the midst of a ruffianly crowd, taken from Albert Dürer's 'Great Passion,' may have inspired his lines on 'The Redemption.' Again, in one of the poems called 'Praise,' the drops of blood on the face of Christ are said to hang 'like streamers neare the top of some fair church, to show the sore and bloodie battell which thou once didst trie.'

'The comparison,' in the editor's words, 'seems very forced and artificial; but in a rudely-coloured German woodcut preserved in the British Museum, the drops of blood have just the appearance of red pennons, and the same effect may have been sometimes seen in stained-glass windows, which abounded in English churches before the Civil War' (p. x).

'This gracious man,' as he is called by Barnabas Oley, his earliest biographer, whose refined feeling made him so sensitive to all forms of beauty, who loved to play the lute and viol, and walked into Salisbury twice a week to hear that cathedral music which seemed to him 'heaven upon earth,' was naturally keenly alive to the impressions which he received from objects of art. He wrote not only on church music, but on church monuments and church windows. The nimbus round the Head of Christ in one painted window, and a bunch of grapes which he saw in another, became the subjects of two of his poems. He was interested in ecclesiastical architecture, and took delight in making his own churches beautiful. By his care the chapel at Bemerton was decorated, and his prebendal church of Leighton Ecclesia in Huntingdonshire, which he found in ruins, was transformed, Izaak Walton tells us, into 'a costly Mosaic, for decency and beauty the most remarkable parish church that this nation affords.' The curious allusion to the 'Christian Art of Germanie' in his poem of 'The Church Militant' is of itself a proof that Herbert was acquainted with the works of foreign masters; and, although he never went abroad himself, his beloved friend, Nicholas Ferrar, made a large collection of sacred prints of German and Flemish origin during the five years which he spent abroad, 1613-1618. Many of these were used to illustrate the 'Harmonies of the Gospels' produced at his religious house in Little Gidding. One of these attracted the attention of King Charles I., who was so much interested in the book that he himself paid a visit to Little Gidding, and begged that a 'Harmony' should be made for him. This book, made for his own royal use, and pronounced by him to be the 'incomparablest book as ever eye beheld,' is now preserved in the British Museum, and several prints are reproduced in the present volume. Another of these 'Harmonies' or 'Concordances,' as they were also called, was made expressly for George Herbert, and in all probability adorned with similar prints. The church of Leighton Ecclesia, which he restored, was only six miles from Little Gidding, and it was his friend Ferrar who first urged him to restore that dilapidated building. Herbert, on his part, suggested the practice of perpetual prayer, which was observed by the pious inmates of Little Gidding, and, there can be little doubt, was among the visitors to

that 'blessed home where Mr. Ferrar and his happy family served God day and night.'

There is certainly a curious affinity between the poems of this sweet singer of the English Church and the art of old German masters. The same unconscious poetry, the same childlike imagination, and the same grotesque vein of allegory and mystic piety meet us in both. Herbert's quaint rhymes on Doomsday,

'Come away,
Make no delay,
Summon all the dust to rise
Till it stirre and rubbe the eyes,
While this member jogs the other,
Each one whispering, Live you, brother,'

remind us forcibly of the crowd of poor souls with flowing locks and startled faces struggling out of their graves and hurrying up the golden stairs in the stained glass of those wonderful old German windows in the church of Fairford, and we can never read his verses on the heavenly garden without thinking of those fair *Paradiesgärten* painted by the old Cologne masters, where the blue-robed Virgin plays with the Child-Christ in the flowery meadows of the celestial country, and gold-haired angels make melody on harp and lute or wreath garlands of roses on the grass,

'Fast in thy Paradise, where no flower can wither.'

And of all German painters the one whose art must have appealed the most to the poet of the Temple was the great Nürnberg master, Albert Dürer.

'The great artist who came under the influence of the Reformation, and the poet-priest, the devoted son of the Church of England, had strong feelings in common. Each dwelt far more on the sterner side of the Gospel history than on its softer features—far more on the Passion than on the Nativity; each had the same intense interest in it, the same homely and direct way of treating it. Both are full of quaint fancies and strange imaginings, to which they give the simplest and most natural expression. The artist refuses no types of form and feature as too common for art, and the poet rejects no words as too homely for poetry. The action of the soldier who is binding a birch-rod in Dürer's "Scourging of Christ" is exactly in the manner of Herbert; so also, it must be confessed, is the introduction of the dog; so is the downright-ness of the blow delivered by St. Peter in the garden. But not one whit less so is the heart-stricken figure of the Man of Sorrows; and the intense feeling of Herbert's lines on the 'Agonie' fully matches the overpowering design of Dürer's, which stands on the same page of this volume' (p. xii).

Even in the painter's lifetime his engravings found their way to England. His own friends, Erasmus and Nicolas Kratzer, introduced them at the court of Henry VIII., where they soon became popular among the followers of the New Learning. As early as 1524 we find Kratzer, who held the post of astronomer to the king, writing to ask Dürer the price of a complete set of his engravings, a request to

which the painter replied by sending him a present of his best prints. And when that great patron and true lover of art, Thomas Howard, Lord Arundel, went to Nürnberg in 1636, he complained that he could find none of Dürer's works for sale, and speaks of a Madonna by this master which had been given him by the Bishop of Würzburg as 'worth more than all the toys I have gotten in Germany.'

Besides the well-known series of the Great and Little Passion, the Apocalypse, the Life of the Virgin, and Kaiser Maximilian's Prayer-book have all helped to supply the present volume with suitable woodcuts. Among the other illustrations here brought together we find prints by Aldegrever, Martin Schöngauer, and Lucas van Leyden, as well as cuts from Holbein's 'Dance of Death' and Whitney's 'Choice Emblems,' both of which were very popular in England. The verses on 'Pilgrimage' are adorned with Marcantonio's fine engraving of St. James of Compostella, the pilgrim's patron saint, after Raphael. A hive of bees from the 'Book of Emblems' illustrates the lines on 'Praise,' with their quaint reference to 'the poor bees that work all day.' The poem on 'Church Monuments' has a print of the tomb of the poet's kinsman, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, in old St. Paul's; that on 'Church Musick' a picture by Hollar of the organ and Gothic arches of the same noble church. In the 'Church Porch' we find a seventeenth century woodcut, representing the interior of a London church during sermon-time, a sight which must often have been witnessed by Herbert when he lived in town, and on another page we see a fine group from the windows of King's College Chapel, which must have been equally familiar to him during his residence at Cambridge. The prints of the potter, the miner, and the coiner are taken from Schopper's *Panoplia*, a work in which the life of craftsmen as it was before the days of machinery is set before us; and the famous lines

'A servant with this clause
Makes drudgery divine'

are aptly illustrated with a print of Martha in the costume of a German *hausfrau*, basting a joint of meat before the kitchen fire, taken from the Little Gidding *Harmony of the Gospels*. Lastly, the quaint rhymes on 'Paradise,' with their lopped-off letters, suggesting the pruning-knife, find an appropriate device in a cut from Mountaine's charming 'Old Gardener's Labyrinth,' with its formal garden and fruit-trees set in a row, exactly as the poet sings:

'I blesse Thee, Lord, because I grow
Among Thy trees, which in a row
To Thee both fruit and order ow.'

The text of this latest edition of *The Temple* is a reprint of the original edition, published in 1633, only a few months after Herbert died. On his death-bed, as our readers will remember, he sent the manuscript of his poems to his dear brother, Nicolas Ferrar, begging him to read it and make it public if he can think it may prove of help to any other poor soul, but if not to burn it. Mr.

Ferrar, Izaak Walton tells us, 'finding the picture of a divine soul in every page,' immediately set about the task of publishing the book, but when the Vice-Chancellor was asked to license it for the press, he objected to the two lines :

'Religion stands a-tip-toe in our land,
Ready to pass to the American strand.'

Ferrar, however, refused to allow any alteration to be made in his friend's poem, and in the end the book was published 'without the diminution or addition of a syllable, saving his own excellent preface.' That preface and address from the printers to the reader is restored to its original place in the present volume. In touching words Ferrar here gives his readers a brief account of his friend's life and of this book, 'inspired by a diviner breath than flows from Helicon,' which he now asks the world to receive 'in that naked simplicity with which he left it,' and ends with Herbert's own motto, 'with which he used to conclude all things that might seem to tend any way to his own honour' : 'Lesse than the least of God's mercies.'

'This on my ring,
This by my picture, in my book I write ;
Whether I sing,
Or say, or dictate, this is my delight.
Lesse then the least
Of all God's mercies is my posie still.'

'Thus,' writes good Izaak Walton, 'he sung on earth such hymns and anthems as the angels and he and Mr. Ferrar now sing in heaven.'

Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott, 1797-1825. 2 vols.
(Edinburgh : David Douglas, 1893.)

MORE than three years have passed away since the editor and publisher of these volumes resolved to make what many thought a rather venturesome appeal to the sympathies of the reading public. Was it true, as Carlyle had predicted would be the case, that there would be no more future gatherings betokening interest in the career of Scott as an author and a man ; or, contrariwise, would it come to pass that the body of gifted men who had expressed a considerable admiration for Scott would find a large amount of public support ? There were partizans on both sides. If it were not thought irreverent to the memory of two great schoolmen, who discussed so much profounder themes, we might almost have ventured to call them Scottists and Thomists ; the one set following the lead of Thomas Carlyle, the other still believing in Walter Scott. It may yet be too soon to pronounce a final judgment. But for the present the verdict seems to have gone entirely in favour of Scott. The publication of his *Journal*, of which Lockhart had only given us portions, was welcomed with a chorus of approbation by the British and the American press ; and that the public ratified the eulogies thus bestowed has been shown by the rapid sale of the first edition, and the call for two successors.

If the *Journal* in its completeness did not actually reveal many facts previously unknown, yet it certainly brought out, with a power and vividness almost entirely its own, the nobleness of the struggle waged by Scott in his endeavour to pay off the tremendous debt which his own imprudence had, to some extent, allowed to fall upon him. It is true that the elevation of Scott's character as a man manifested by that publication does not necessarily, not at least directly, affect our estimate of the value of his writings. But we suspect that many minds are affected by it, even in regard to Scott as an author, and that not altogether unreasonably. A man's words seem to mean more, when we know that his life has shown that words have been to him no mere counters, but realities.

We have now before us an addition to the *Journal*, consisting of two volumes of Scott's *Familiar Letters*. This last publication may not in all respects possess the thrilling interest of the former. The correspondence ceases before the crash came; consequently a reader unacquainted with the *Journal* and with Lockhart's *Life* would not obtain the full measure of Scott's character. We see him in these letters as a happy and brilliantly successful man, confident in his position, and never dreaming, to all appearance, of the blow that was so soon to fall upon him. Nevertheless these letters are not without a charm of their own. If they do not exhibit Scott in the grandest phase of his character—in the struggle against adversity,—they are still very pleasing, and fully justify the claim made by Lockhart on behalf of Scott—namely, that he had great power of adapting himself to the tastes and needs of those whom he addressed. This plasticity was not displayed with any view to mean or selfish advantages, but from kindly consideration for his correspondents. Two high-born ladies occupy a very prominent place in these volumes—the Marchioness of Abercorn and Lady Louisa Stuart. Scott, in his *Redgauntlet*, is supposed to describe his own father in the character of Mr. Fairford, senior. He speaks of him as having 'never entirely shaken off the slavish awe of the great, which, in his earlier days, they had so many modes of commanding.' There arose a younger generation, which in turn accused Scott himself of undue deference to earls and dukes; but his correspondence with the two ladies above named, though perfectly respectful, is most creditable, we think, to both sides. He treats them as ladies who, if highly placed, are yet persons of sense and of critical power. They both frankly criticize the poems and the novels; and if, on the one hand, he is often compelled to admit the justice of their strictures, it is evident that they are fully sensible of the honour conferred on them by their happy and intimate relations with a man of genius. From another female correspondent, Lady Hood, Scott receives a justly severe reprimand (i. 229) for one of the few ungenerous acts of which he was ever guilty. We refer to the sad omission, on political grounds, of the name of Sir John Moore from the list of British heroes in the *Vision of Don Roderick*. As elsewhere, Scott shows that he is not insensible to faults among those to whom he would not willingly impute blame. Thus he gives us

(ii. 8) a striking instance of the partiality of a court, in telling how three sets of people concerned in the preservation of the Scottish Regalia were rewarded in precisely adverse proportion to their merits. With all his love for his countrymen and his appreciation of their better qualities, he is very sensible of the manner in which their caution and reserve tend to create an unfavourable impression on those whose acquaintance with them may be slight.

As in public, so in private, he is always nobly free from the slightest taint of literary jealousy. While his estimate of his own works is thoroughly modest, he is full of the praises of the Lake poets, and very sensible of the excellence of Wordsworth and Southey as men. His judgment upon Jeffrey (i. 128) is admirably fair and discriminating.

Of course the limitations of Scott's powers occasionally appear. To say nothing of the effect of deep political prejudice—the editor calls our attention to one extreme instance in vol. ii. p. 141—there are literary pastures for which he has no taste. When, nearly three years ago, in this *Review*, we had said that Scott was probably right in eschewing Greek subjects, we were not forgetful of what English poetry owes to Greece (as seen in the pages of Milton, Gray, and Tennyson), but merely meant to intimate our conviction that this style of poetry was not in Scott's line. As regards Latin, it is curious that, though Scottish advocates have usually attained a fair mastery over Latin prose, they seem to have given up, after the days of Buchanan, all attention to Latin verse. Scott, in these letters, some half a dozen times cites a line from Virgil or Juvenal, and five times out of six his mode of quotation thoroughly mars the scanning of the line. In Italian, though fond of the romantic poets, especially Ariosto, he cannot read Dante (ii. 356).

We must not, while recommending our readers to *Scott's Letters* as an innocent and even elevating source of enjoyment, omit to express our appreciation of the merits of his correspondents. Lady Louisa Stewart's letters are often charming, and those of his friend Mr. Morritt of Rokeby (to whom his biography was destined to be dedicated) display abundant evidence of good feeling and of literary taste.

Among the letters of Lockhart there are some written during an Irish tour, in which he accompanied his father-in-law. He was evidently ill at ease, being anxious to rejoin his wife and children. Consequently the accounts sent home to Mrs. Lockhart may be tinged with a slight degree of prejudice. No doubt in the year 1825 religion was at a low ebb in many quarters, but we were hardly prepared for the standard of Hiberno-Anglicanism at St. Patrick's Cathedral. 'The music,' says Lockhart, 'was exquisite, both the boys of the choir and the singers of the anthem; but,' he adds, 'nobody seemed to think of the service—scarcely a Prayer Book open—nor did I hear a single response but from the officials' (ii. 305).

We have scarcely space for an extract. Readers of the volumes may find a great variety suitable to different tastes. With much

diffidence we select two. Here is one referring to an account of one of the many canine inmates of the household. Scott writes to his married daughter, Sophia, touching the behaviour of Lady Scott's favourite, named Ourisque, on the occasion of the death of its mistress :—

‘It remained in the room without stirring and without tasting food for many hours, when all of a sudden it transferred its regard to Anne, left the fatal room, and now lies on Anne's bed, whom two days since she would not allow to touch her. Its fondness for me seemed quite like a rational creature who had lost a friend and sought consolation from another’ (ii. 93 *n.*).

The critique on Jeffrey, which is too long for our pages, we have already eulogized. For a briefer specimen we will turn to Scott's enjoyment of good acting. He is full of the praises of Mrs. Siddons, and of her equally eminent brother, John Kemble, speaking enthusiastically of his rendering of Cato and Coriolanus. Concerning the retirement of Mrs. Siddons from the stage we have an account given by the editor.

‘Mrs. Siddons retired from the London stage on June 30, 1812, at Covent Garden, where she acted Lady Macbeth with so much power that, at the conclusion of the sleep scene, the audience could not bear to look on any of the other actors, though John Kemble was there. He led his sister to the front of the stage, where she delivered with great emotion her parting words, ending with—

“And breathes with swelling heart her long, her last farewell.”

The audience took leave of their favourite with great acclamation, and at once left the house without waiting for the conclusion of the play’ (i. 280 *n.*).

Information respecting the *status* of Scott's correspondents, not too prolix, but quite full enough to make their position intelligible to the reader, will be found in the notes to these volumes. They are admirably edited, and should certainly be studied in addition to the *Journal* by all who desire to understand and to appreciate the author of *Marmion* and *Waverley*.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXVII.

APO

A POLLINIARIUS OF LAO-DICEA, 118 *sqq.*; statement of what has been hitherto accepted as to his teaching, 119; works attributed to him in the pamphlet *Adversus Fraudes Apollinaristarum*, 121; Von Dräseke's researches and results: the Correspondence with St. Basil, 124; the treatise against the Arian Eunomius, 125; the Three Dialogues on the Holy Trinity, 126; a treatise on the Holy Trinity, 127; the question of the theology of Apollinarius, 128; proofs that his followers early perverted his doctrine, 129; the charge that he taught that Christ's flesh was pre-existent (*προαιώνιον*), 130; examination of his peculiar teaching, 131; of the statement that he was a Traducian, 133; his defence of the Nicene Creed against the Arians, *ib.*; influence upon St. Cyril, 134; his defence of the truth of Christ's Divinity, 135; personal character of Apollinarius, 135 *sq.*

Apologetics (review of Dr. A. B. Bruce's *Apologetics, or Christianity defensively stated*), 20 *sqq.*; changed condition of the methods of Apologetics, 20; distinction between 'apology' and 'apologetic,' 21; various definitions, 22; Dr. Bruce's point of view, 23; his statement of Christianity inadequate as an apologetic, 24; contrast with the work of Bishop Harvey Goodwin, 25; recent opinion on the *method* of apologetic, 26; Dr. Bruce's method: how it fails as apologetic, 27; his treatment of presuppositions hostile to Christianity, 28; statement of Christian philosophy,

BLO

29; the doctrine of sin, 31; the creation of the world, 32; Providence, hope for the future, 33; the author's treatment of the history of Israel: the Graf-Wellhausen theory, 34; effect of recent discoveries in archæology, 37; history in the Pentateuch, 38; Mosaism, 41; the Decalogue, 42; Christology, 44; theories of the Resurrection: Keim's, 45; Dr. Martineau's, 46; the author's conclusions, 48

Aristotle and Christian Ethics (review of Mr. Stewart's *Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics*), 321 *sqq.*; popular theory of the *Ethics*, 322; the environment of Aristotle's ideal man, 324; his nature, 325; the relation between the State and the man, 326; why Aristotle's system was so long-lived, 329; St. Thomas Aquinas's use of Aristotle's *Ethics*, 331; their agreement and differences, 333; the secret of Aristotle's permanent value, 336

BERNARD of Clairvaux (review of Dr. Storrs' work), 300 *sqq.*; St. Bernard's childhood, 302; his mother, 303; monastic life, 305; visions and miracles, 306; at Clara Vallis (Clairvaux), 308; manner of life, *ib.*; the luxury of Clugny, 310; schism in the Papacy, 312; Hildebrand and the Emperor, 313; Bernard as arbitrator, 314; controversy with Abelard, 315; Synod of Sens: Abelard's surrender, 317; the Second Crusade, 318; Bernard's unique influence, 319

Blomfield, Bishop (Colchester),

BOD

- The Old Testament and the New Criticism*, 221
 Body, Rev. Canon, *The Guided Life*, 248; *The Life of Love*, 249
Book by Book, 227
 Boyd Carpenter, Bishop, *The Son of Man among the Sons of Men*, 514; *Twilight Dreams*, 515

CAMBRIDGE *Companion to the Bible*, 215

Cambridge Sermons preached before the University, &c., ed. Rev. C. H. Prior, 509

Christ in Modern Theology, *The Place of* (review of Dr. Fairbairn's work), 50 *sqq.*; criticism of his views on the influence of the environments of the Faith in the early centuries of the Church, 50; there was from the first a deposit of the Faith, 51; gradual enrichment and modification of the Church's terminology, 52; doctrine of the Trinity, 53; Patristic doctrine on the Holy Spirit, 54; Dr. Fairbairn's views on the Atonement, 56; the Fatherhood of God, 57; argument, against the author, that Christianity is a sacerdotal religion, 58; influence of Lutheran theologians on his view of the Incarnation, 61; our Lord's knowledge, 62; Dr. Fairbairn's views of Old Testament teaching about sin, 64; rejection of the false idea of 'compulsory restoration,' 65; summary statement of true beliefs as opposed to some of Dr. Fairbairn's opinions, 66

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 166 *sqq.*; Mr. Dykes Campbell's edition of the poet's *Poetical Works*: its characteristics, 167; objections to the scheme of the work, 167 *sq.*; doubt as to the need of a minute biographical Introduction to a popular edition, 168; desiderata in various classes of biography, 169; questions Mr. Campbell has refrained from answering, 170; sketch of Coleridge's life, 170 *sqq.*; the 'Pantisocracy' scheme, 171; at Stowey: the Wordsworths,

ELL

Thomas and Josiah Wedgwood, *ib.*; visit to Germany, *ib.*; at Greta Hall: a slave to opium, *Kubla Khan*, *Dejection*, 172; work between 1802-1813, 173; his life at Highgate: his table talk, *ib.*; death, 174; paucity of his great works, *ib.*; characteristics of his poetry, 174; its mystery, and mastery of language and rhythm, 175; supreme merit of his best work, 176; Coleridge as he was known by his friends, 177; Lamb's testimony, 178

DENOMINATIONAL Schools and the Rates, 1 *sqq.*; expected alterations in the Education Act of 1870: what the secularist party desire, 1; complaints and proposals of Churchmen, 2; working of the Cowper-Temple clause, 3; Nonconformists and the conscience clause, 4; 'religious liberty' now construed to mean liberty to believe nothing, 5; the Education Department desires to suppress voluntary denominational schools, 6; examples of its methods, 7; details of the heavy demand on friends of voluntary schools, 8 *sq.*; effect of the strain on lukewarm friends, 9; evil intensified by writings of advocates of the 'Higher Criticism,' *ib.*; financial difficulty considered, 10; comparative cost of education in board schools and voluntary schools, 11; consideration of means of easing the present strain, 13; grounds and provisos of a concordat: freedom to teach religion, 14; a voice in the selection of teachers, 15; objections considered of some Manchester Churchmen, 16; of some others, 17; the District Councils suggested as the rating authority to carry out any scheme adopted, 19

ELLICOTT, Bishop, *Foundations of Sacred Study*, 505

ENG

English Saints of the English Calendar (Anon.), 256
 Errington, Mr. F. H. L., *The Clergy Discipline Act, 1892, and Rules, &c.*, 244

FOREGLEAMS of Christianity, *The* (Mr. C. N. Scott's work), 179 *sqq.*; the meaning of the appeal of early Christian apologists to the consciences of the heathen, 179; causes of a less sympathetic view of the heathen, 180; the true Christian method of studying the Science of Religion, 181; examination of Mr. Scott's seven stages in the evolution of the external revelation of God; Fetichism, 182; Pantheism, *ib.*; Polytheism, 183; anthropomorphic Polytheism, 184; Dualism, 186; Monotheism, Henotheism, Satan, Spiritualism, 187; Theism, 188; 'divinatory revelation,' 189; Mr. Scott's treatment of religious progress and corruption, 190; his three conclusions from his investigations, 191

HELPS to the Study of the Bible, 219
 Herbert, George, *The Temple*, 519
Homer and the Epic (Mr Andrew Lang's book reviewed), 472 *sqq.*; the question as to divided authorship of the Homeric poems: Wolf's *Prolegomena*, 473; the supposition that writing was unknown in Homeric period, 474; the theory that the poems were originally short lays, 475; and that Pisistratus edited them, 476; the modern theory: an *Achilleid* by Homer, with additions by other poets, 477; aberrations of criticism, 478; the argument from differences in vocabulary, 480; some well grounded arguments, 481; the embassy to Achilles (bk. ix.), 483; the tenth book, 485; books xii. to xv., 486; the Shield of Achilles and the Theomachy, 487; books xxiii. and xxiv., 489; objections to the theory of inter-

VOL. XXXVII.—NO. LXXIV.

NAT

polators, 490; the work is substantially that of a single poet, 491; consideration of the problems of the *Odyssey*, 494
 Huntingdon, Rev. G., *Random Recollections of some Noted Bishops, &c., of the 'Old Church' of Manchester*, 512

JONES, Miss C. A., *Stories about the Wonderful Kingdom, &c.; Under the King's Banner; Saints of the Prayer Book*, 251
 Judaism in Fiction, 364 *sqq.*; varied presentation of Jews, 364; Mr. Zangwill's *The Children of the Ghetto*: a strange jargon, 365; a 'sharp boy,' 366; Jewish Sabbatarianism, *ib.*; domestic life, 368; Mr. Zangwill's heroine, 369; Jewish desires for a spiritualized Judaism, 370; neither Protestantism nor Rationalism can satisfy their desires, 372; nor the 'Broad Church,' 373; why Judaism has been preserved, 374

LAW, WILLIAM, 193 *sqq.*; causes of his remaining so little known for so long, 193; the *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, 195; his high sacramental views, 196; his mysticism, 198; his career, *ib.*; forms a religious community at King's Cliffe, *ib.*; influence of his writings, 200; their literary value, 201; views of the Atonement, 202; his eschatology, *ib.*; attitude towards the Church of Rome, 203
 Lindsay, Rev. J., *The Progressiveness of Modern Christian Thought*, 243

MISSALE ad Usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis, ed. J. Wickham Legg, fasc. 2, 235
 Molesworth, Mrs. *Stories of the Saints for Children*, 254

NATURAL Theology and Evolution (review of Bishop Barry's 'Bampton Lectures'), M M

OFF

257 *sqq.*; the function of Law as leading to Christ, 258; 'Truth in Revelation': the Bible Revelation of God, 261; the 'reign of Law,' 262; new method of Natural Theology necessitated by Science, 266; Evolution and the Incarnation, 267; Bishop Barry's treatment of 'Evolution,' 268; what Evolution really is, 270 *sq.*; intelligent Theism proclaims the continuity of causes as emphatically as Evolution, 272; Evolution injurious to Science, 273; a truncated and impossible theory, 275

OFFICIUM *Ecclesiasticum Abbatum secundum Usus Eveshamensis Monasterii*, ed. H. Austin Wilson, 240

Old Testament and Modern Criticism, The, 276 *sqq.*; Professor Duff's *Old Testament Theology* criticized, 277; Professor Schulz's work, 278; his views on Biblical criticism, 279; on Old Testament literature, 280; Israel's religion, 282; the 'four main streams of tradition,' 284; of Abraham, 286; Lot at Sodom, 288; solar myths, 289; authorship of Leviticus, 290; Old Testament Theology, 292; Personality of God, 293; miracles, 296; origin of sin, *ib.*; the Servant of Jehovah in Isaiah liii., 297; lame and impotent conclusion, 299

Oliphant, Mrs., *Thomas Chalmers, Preacher, Philosopher and Statesman*, 247

PALESTINIAN *Version of the Holy Scriptures, The*, ed. G. H. Gwilliam (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*), 501

Parish Councils Bill, the, 204 *sqq.*; essential difference between town and country conditions, 2057; changed conditions of the Vestry, 206; and of Boards of Guardians, 207; analysis of the Bill: parish meetings and parish councils, 208; guardians and district councils: women voters, 209; the interpre-

PUS

tation clause: 'trustees,' 'ecclesiastical charity,' 210; criticism of Mr. Fowler's promised 'broad dividing line between civil and ecclesiastical matters,' 211; the sidewind course towards disestablishment and disendowment, 214

Principles of Ethics, The (Mr. Spencer's work), 84 *sqq.*; intellectual energy and self-devotion displayed in carrying to the end the author's grand design, 85; his limited conception of ethics, *ib.*; statement of Christian ethics as opposed to this, 87; the author's explanation of the origin of religion, 89; he acknowledges his moral system to be purely naturalistic, 90; example of the insufficiency of his induction of particulars, 91; his 'Summary of Inductions,' 92; views on war, 93; reprobation of Christian teachers, 94; his confession of failure, 95; casuistry in small matters, 96; the 'insane subordination of reality to show,' 97; comparison of Mr. Spencer's work with Professor Huxley's *Romanes Lecture*, 98; limits to the influence of the physical world on ethics, 99; advantages which Christian ethics possess over those of Mr. Spencer, 100; Christians have their Moral Ideal in their Master, 101

Pusey, Dr. (the *Life* by Canon Liddon reviewed), 393 *sqq.*; excellence of the work, 393; sketch of Pusey's early life, 395; visit to Germany, 397; marriage, 399; controversy with H. J. Rose, 400; Regius Professor of Hebrew, 401; politics, 402; beginning of the Oxford Movement, 404; the Tracts, 406; the *Library of the Fathers*, 408; charge of Romanizing, 410; Bishop Bagot's Charge against the Tracts, 413; the 'Martyrs' Memorial,' 414; domestic sorrows, 416; the term 'Puseyism,' 417; Tract XC., 419; difference between Newman and Pusey, 424; Pusey's visit to Irish convents, 426; the Jerusalem

RED

bishopric, 427; Mr. Isaac Williams's tract on 'Reserve,' 428; Pusey's relations with Newman, 430; his condemnation and suspension, 431; Newman's correspondence with Pusey, 434; Pusey and Manning, 438; the secession of Newman and others, *ib.*; death of Pusey's daughter Lucy, 440; the building of St. Saviour's, Leeds, 441; Pusey's deep and immovable faith in God, 445

RED Letter Saints (S.P.C.K.),
254

ST. JOHN in Asia Minor, 446 *sqq.*; authorship and date of the Apocalypse, 448; commentaries on it, 450; St. John in Patmos, 453; he addresses the Churches of the Asiatic mainland, 455; Ephesus, 456; Smyrna, Pergamus, 457; Thyatira, 458; Sardis, Philadelphia, 459; Laodicea, 460; dangers to which the Asiatic Churches were exposed, 461; exegesis of the visions, 463; the seals, 464; the measuring of the Temple, 466; the two Witnesses, *ib.*; the seventh trumpet, 468; the struggle between the Woman's Seed and the Beast, 469; the rider of the Beast, 470; the historical position indicated by this imagery, 471

St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford (review of Mr. Ffoulkes's *History of the church*), 101 *sqq.*; varied elements of interest in St. Mary's, 102; criticism of Mr. Ffoulkes's style, 103; and of the heterogeneous contents of the book, 104; remote history of the church, 105; Robert (Cardinal) Pullen and John of Oxford, 106; Peter de Kyllum and Adam de Marisco, 107; Walter of Merton, 108; the Congregation House, 109; various distinguished preachers, 110; a sermon by Dr. Pullen, 111; incidents of 1400-1450, 112; Wycliffe, 113; St. Mary's rebuilt, 114; Cranmer's

SER

trial, *ib.*; Queen Elizabeth at St. Mary's, 116; Newman as Vicar of the church, 117
Saints of the Fourth Century (Anon), 255
Scott, Sir Walter, Familiar Letters of, 523
Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., preparations for the, 137 *sqq.*; the First Prayer Book intended to be only temporary, 137; a Zwinglian book by Thomas Lancaster (1549), on the Lord's Supper, 138; deterioration of morals and increase of heresy, 139; the interval between the two Prayer Books, 140; Bernardino Ochino's career, 141; his *Tragoedie or Dialogue*, &c., 141 *sqq.*; the old service books ordered to be destroyed, 144; the new Prayer Book unpopular, 145; Bale's *The Image of the two Churches*, 146; Bishop John Hooper's doctrine, 147; Jugge's revision of Tynedale's New Testament, 148; specimens of its notes, 150 *sqq.*; W. Salisburys's 'The baterie of the Pope's Botereulx, commonly called the high Altare,' 152; identity of teaching between the English and the Swiss divines, 153; anti-sacramental works by John Veron, 154; specimens of the notes, 155; extreme Calvinism: Walter Lynne's *The true beliefe in Christ and His Sacramentes*, 156; influence of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, 158; enormous increase in the number of Anabaptists in England, *ib.*; treatment of Baptism in the Second Prayer Book, 159; the baptism of infants, 160; influence of Peter Martyr and Alasco, 161; Communion of the Sick, 162; John Veron's defence of the baptism of infants, 163; Peter Martyr's account of the meaning and intention of the Second Prayer Book on this point, 164
Service Book of the seventh century, A, 337 *sqq.*; account of *The Antiphonary of Bangor* (published by Henry Bradshaw So-

SOC

- ciety), 337; antiquity of the MS., 338; the monastic system before St. Benedict, 339; the round of services of each 'Rule,' 340; the Rule of Columban, 341; the 'Course' distinguished from 'Canonical Services,' 342; the Day-Hours and Night-Services, 344; comparison with the Bangor Antiphonary, 346; synopsis of Sunday Lauds in three rites, 350; reconstruction of Sunday Lauds at Bangor, 351; meaning of 'ad Matutinam,' 354; some doubtful points, 355; the *Preces communes ad horas*, 357; the Bangor Intercessions were *biddings*, 362
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Classified Digest of the Records of the, 516
Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, vol. iii., 231

THEODULF of Orleans (review of M. Cuissard's *Théodulfe Evêque d'Orléans*), 377 *sqq.*; excellence of the work, 377; Theodulf's nationality, 378; made bishop of Orleans and Abbot of Fleury, 379; social life of the time, 382; Theodulf's theological works, 383; imprisonment, 384; death, 385; his work in reforming the clergy, *ib.*; scheme of education, 386; objection to private Masses and to pilgrimages, 387; his Recension of the Bible, 388; works attributed to him, 390; his sketch

WOO

- of the duties of a Christian life, 392
 Thompson, Mr. E. M., *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*, 497

WALTZING, Prof. J. P., *Le Recueil Général des Inscriptions Latines*, &c., 502
 Ward, W. G., in the Church of Rome, 67 *sqq.*; sketch of his career as Professor at St. Edmund's College, 68; the new strain of vigour thereby imparted to the Roman priesthood in England, 69; the growth of New Ultramontanism and the assertion of Papal Infallibility, 70; Ward's speculative instincts, 71; the Vatican Council's decision on the Pope's Infallibility, 72; a difference between Ward and Newman: estimate of their respective views, 73; the essence of Romanism is applied logic, 75; Mr. Ward's attack on Mill's empirical philosophy, 76; method and argument in the attack, 77; its value appraised, 78; his intuitive theory of memory, 79; expansion of that theory by the doctrine of evolution, 81; arguments in connexion with the idea of Cause and the idea of God, 81; Mr. Ward's argument for Freedom, 82
 Wolff, Miss J. S., *Stories from the Lives of Saints and Martyrs*, &c., 254
 Wood, C. J., *Survivals in Christianity*, 245

fe,

ok
ty,

Re-
ip-

of
his
ed-
ew
red
ng-
ew
er-
o ;
I ;
on
a
nd
re-
nce
gic,
ll's
nod
77 ;
in-
79 ;
the
gu-
dea
od,
for

the
&c.,

sti-